Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #1062NY-1 for Eastern Suffolk Board of Cooperative Educational Services

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	8

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant is a consortium of 18 school districts in Long Island, NY. It has set forth a comprehensive and coherent reform vision that builds upon the State of New York's Race to the Top Phase II application. The proposal outlines the four core assurance areas that the Consortium has been supporting–standards and assessments, data systems, great teachers and leaders, and turning around low achieving schools. The reform vision of the proposed "Full STEAM Ahead" initiative is to "regionally focus and accelerate progress in the core educational assurance areas in which NYS has been engaged" and to continue to advance Long Island's STEM emphasis including a focus on art as part of the current Long Island Renaissance.

The proposed vision is comprehensive and coherent and does advance work in the 4 core educational assurance areas. The overarching goal is to create "personalized learning environments for all Long Island students across multiple subject areas, but with an emphasis improving outcomes for high need students." Grades 3-8 in "eligible schools" will be served. Key aspects of this reform vision are changes in the organization and delivery of instruction by teachers with the support of parents and leaders in the service of students.

The proposed initiatives hinge primarily on professional development and teacher/leader evaluation; increased understanding and use of data and data systems to inform student achievement and effective teaching. There is a strong focus on turning around low–achieving schools through technical assistance aimed at closing the achievement gap and making Adequate Yearly Progress, but also improving program choices and selecting of interventions; coordination of services between general and special education; creating and implementing Comprehensive District Education Planning (CDEP); and creating school-based or school linked services with regional networks and institutions of higher education.

A three pronged approach is advanced consisting of 1) expert professional development that is job embedded and aligned to each of the core assurance areas and STEAM content areas in alignment with the, Common Core State Standards; 2) school-based personalized learning teams to support personalized learning environments and share best practices; 3) a customized Data and Learning Portal in which teachers can provide lessons and assessments to provide individualized data with a website interface to make such resources available 24/7 to students and parents and the educational community at large.

The universe of partners involved is significant. In addition to the core 18 LEA's and Cooperative Educational Service partners, there are multiple Community Expert Partners to advance the social emotional learning needs of students and families and support in other ways. It is proposed to add 5 of these partners annually.

The applicants share a very clear logic model that outlines needs, personalized learning objectives, activities/outputs, resources, and outcomes for each of the 4 educational assurance areas as well as the competitive preference. The Logic Model outlines activities and measures of the proposed professional development, Data and Learning Portal, teacher and leader evaluation models, etc. Projected performance measures are high - -often 90% of a particular group will show improvement or participation, but, in most cases the measures proposed – particularly those for teacher and leader professional development and growth -- are based on self-reports of improvement on workshop or online surveys. Student data are based primarily on assessments.

There is no explicit discussion about the degree to which personalized student support will be "grounded in common an individual tasks that are based on students' academic interests" or how these efforts contribute to "increasing equity."

	Available	Score
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	8

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

In terms of articulating the approach and process the applicant used to select schools to participate in the Full STEAM Ahead reform that meet the eligibility requirements, the evidence in this section of the proposal would suggest that they have done

this to a great extent. Applicants tell the story of how the consortium was formed and how participating schools were identified primarily based on high needs and the ability to comply with the eligibility assurances. The description is comprehensive and includes, also, information about how stakeholder input was solicited, gathered, and fed back into the process. A rationale for focusing this reform on grades 3 through 8 is not provided.

50 schools are involved serving 20,844 students of which 56% come from low income families and 77% demonstrate either academic high-need, are disabled, or are English Learner, low income, and/or homeless. It is not clear whether this latter percentage includes the former 56% of low-income students but the assumption is that is does. 1036 teachers and 48 leaders will also be involved. it is not made fully clear how schools were selected to participate, whether all 3-8 grade schools in an LEA are participating. The table provided shows evidence that a preponderance of schools have low income and high needs, but not whether the schools involved would be considered turnaround schools or lowest performing schools.

This focus on high needs students is aligned with the RTTD intent and -- outside of a lack of specificity about school selection and characteristics -- the criteria addressed by the consortium would seem to suggest that the applicant has an approach to implementation that is largely credible and viable.

(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	7

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant does present a plan describing how Full STEAM Ahead will be scaled up and translated into district-wide change beyond initial participating schools. With the ultimate goal of establishing personalized learning environments throughout the entire Long Island region, the applicant suggests that ultimate LEA-wide reform and change begins with initial project implementation. The plan identifies activities and rationales, a broad timeline, some key deliverables, and some indication of responsible parties. The plan, overall, is credible.

Throughout the life of the project the applicants propose using established lines of communication and activities to share Full STEAM Ahead goals and progress and to encourage early adoption by other LEAs. Information learned from ongoing Team reviews of Full STEAM Ahead will be fed back into the LEA recruitment process during the grant and as the grant ends. Another strategy is identifying key personnel in current LEAs who have been instrumental in successfully implementing Full STEAM Ahead and encouraging them to act as ambassadors to recruit and orient other schools and districts. Identifying a cadre of Master Teachers is another proposed way to advance scale up activities since these individuals can provide clear information and professional development on implementation. Lastly, a region–wide conference is proposed to orient non-participating LEAs to the project with an eye toward recruitment.

While this is a quality plan, it lacks specificity, particularly in how it will communicate the goals and activities that it has outlined in its theory of change and, most importantly, who will be served, how learning outcomes will be improved, and how potential districts can also work to implement this approach toward lasting educational change and improvement for high-needs students and schools.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	3

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Tables A4 a, b, c, and d provide evidence of actual baseline data and projected targets through School Years 2012-2017 for A) summative assessment performance, B) decreasing the achievement gap, C) graduation rates, and D) college enrollment rates for each participating LEA by grade and subgroup. There is no narrative to further explain the assumptions underlying each table and/or how particular data were calculated or represented. As a result, it is not only difficult to ascertain what the tables are intended to show through their data alone, but also how the applicant intends to mobilize these data in service of its proposal. For example, different districts show different annual percentage gains in math scores – 3%, 5%, 8% -- but it is not clear how have they been calculated and applied and, in particular, how they are being applied across a grade to all subpopulations with an eye toward improving achievement and closing achievement gaps. As well, it is unclear why entries with 0 in the 2010-2011 and/or 2011-2012 baseline columns would project performance scores from 10 to 50 during 2012-2017. It is not clear whether, in these instances, the 0 means that 0 students are proficient on the assessment or that there are 0 students who took the assessment. If, in fact, there are no students in a particular grade and subgroup who have scored proficient or above on their assessments, then a 10% annual score increase may be too ambitious. It is also not clear whether there is an attempt to weight the proposed percentage increases so that lower achieving students would achieve greater percentages to close the achievement gap.

In the case of Table A4b, all cells are populated with negative numbers and there is no formula presented or narrative to explain why this is the case and what it might mean -- again making it difficult to assess this section. These numbers do not seem to reflect the solicitation's suggested algorithm for calculating the achievement gap. What is also unclear in this section, however, is whether or not the projected values are truly trying to reduce the achievement gap relative to a standard and, if so,

what that standard is. Even if these projections are correct (outside of the negative number), many, as proposed, are extremely high – even at the end of 4/5 years (e.g., Roosevelt UFSD will have a -40 achievement gap value for Hispanic 3rd graders in 2017).

In the case of increasing graduation rates, baseline and projected data are evident but, again, how projections are calculated is not clear between and among groups within a district or across districts in the consortium. Overall, and visually, the projected graduation rates look quite robust and, in most cases seem reasonable based on the baseline data provided. In some cases, graduation rate projections for students with disabilities seem unrealistic (e.g., South Country district's proposal to raise graduation rates for student with disabilities from 42% in 2011-2012 to 71% in 2016-2017). The same critiques and comments can be applied to the college enrollment data.

Overall, the evidence for this section is confusing regarding data for the 18 participating LEAs. Some data seem incorrect and assumptions underlying them are not clear. At the same time, and particularly in terms of graduation rates and college enrollment, the projections seem ambitious and achievable except in the case of students with disabilities. Because there is such indeterminacy in the data and projections -- particularly as they relate to student achievement and growth and closing achievement gaps -- its is not very clear that this vision will result in success.

B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	4

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant presents evidence for the BOCES Management Team's track record of success in creating and supporting conditions for reform. It shares four examples: two demonstrate capacity to support regional technical assistance; one shows significant involvement in the development and use of New York State's Longitudinal Data System (LDS); and one indicates that RICS, like those in the BOCES management team, often support common learning system and parent porthole platforms and their applications. Actual data in the form of an evaluation report on the impact of the LIRSSC's support of special needs in schools and student improvement between 2000 and 2010 is included in the Appendix and shows real impact (e.g., LIRSSC improvement of Districts in Need of Improvement from 10 to 3 (with 2 in good standing using similar methods to what are proposed for Full STEAM Ahead)). The report explicitly states that the applicant did not close the achievement gaps in the schools it was serving despite good and hard work.

The "report detailing student cohort growth by school district" referenced in the narrative to show evidence of the impact of the RES-TASC initiative is not in the appendix. Empirical data is not provided regarding the applicant's success in developing and implementing the New York State's Longitudinal Data System, but it states "partner experiences are derived from years of comprehensive operations in Level 1 of the [longitudinal data system] and specifically in support of the utilization and enhancement of the Level 0 web tool accessed by school districts" – specifically the Suffolk and Nassau Regional Information Centers. No evidence is provided, but the narrative states that RICs support all common parent portals. There is also no evidence of how long the relationship has been in place.

As indicated in the first paragraph of this review, there is some evidence of 4 years of past success in supporting student achievement and learning as well as reforms in persistently lowest achieving schools. However, the evidence is not provided for all four examples.

The applicant states that most Full STEAM Ahead LEAs have developed, and use, web-based Parent Portals through which they make student performance data available to students and educators and parents. No evidence of this is provided or of the Consortium's or various LEA's use of NY's Longitudinal Data System and the web-based interface accessible to parents and communities.

Overall, the evidence provided to show a track record of success over the past four years is either non-existent or not robust enough to support the assertion.

	Available	Score
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	2

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant does not provide evidence of a high level of transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments -- by district or by school -- although it does direct readers to SeethroughNY.com where district salaries for individual teachers and administrators in all NY schools are made available to the public. There is likewise no discussion of public presentation of

salaries and expenditures of CES partners; and readers are directed to annual school budgets for transparent accounting of non-personnel expenditures. This would not constitute a strong presentation of evidence; nor a strong argument for a high level of transparency.

(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	3

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant suggests NY State has advanced the commitment/belief that all children can learn. With this, the state has advanced an organizational openness to innovations that may result in improved educational attainment and college and career readiness. The applicants discuss legislation such as the Title 8 Part 100 Section 11 state mandate that LEAs and BOCES develop plans and planning teams for school-based shared decision-making – including that there is an expectation that new information gleaned throughout the process is fed back for continuous improvement. Applicants also share that the State supports the kinds of activities advanced by district reform models like Full STEAM Ahead through two offices that are "focused upon providing LEA's with statutory, legal and regulatory support for school change models:" the Office of Innovative School Models and the External Technical Assistance Center for Turnaround Schools. Evidence of what these entities do and/or their support in the form of a letter to the applicant is not provided. In addition, information about autonomy related to budget, hiring, etc. is not provided.

The applicant makes the argument, but does not provide strong evidence for, conditions and autonomy under state legal, statutory, and regulatory requirements to support strong implementation of the personalized learning environments described. A supportive state context for implementation is therefore not strongly supported.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	6

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has provided a large quantity of evidence of partner and stakeholder support, but the quality of this support is not always evident. Evidence includes the Superintendent, Board of Education, and Teacher's Union Representative's signatures on the MOU's at the application's front end. The letters in the appendix represent support from appropriate partners, stakeholders, and contacts from the State; 13 affected municipalities; the additional two managing partners (BOCES and Nassau BOCES); 14 local stakeholders from participating schools districts and PTAs; 16 community expert partners who will provide enrichment, early childhood, and other activities – most focused on the arts and sciences; and 20 integrated school support partners involved to work with Full STEAM Ahead on issues of social emotional learning and behavior. Each partner is committed to helping implement personalized learning environments. It should be noted that the State letter indicates that 6 districts and 2 charter schools do not have State-approved APPR plans (evaluation plans) and that the proposal would be strengthened if such plans were in place and approved. The applicant provides a response to say it will work with those districts and schools with plans under review or needing to submit plans to develop an APPR plan as required by law. It does not mention submitting the plan to the state for review.

In this section of the proposal, the applicant does not provide strong evidence of stakeholder engagement in the development of the proposal and the evidence of support of the proposal through stakeholder letters is somewhat diminished due to many of the letters clearly being derived from forms. That being said, there is a wide range of community partners willing to provide enrichment experiences and support the core work of this consortium – universities, aquaria, community businesses, etc. This is a real strength of the proposal. This can also be said of the Integrated School Support Partners.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	2

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant indicates that a baseline analysis of each LEA's status "for implementing personalized learning environments" will be undertaken within the 1st 6 months of the project. They refer reviewers to the project's logic model for generic areas of need and rationales for project activities based on the research literature. The Logic Model itself does show these areas of need with project activities already aligned. There is nothing in the Logic Model, however – the high-quality plan for Full STEAM Ahead reform – to indicate when, how, and by whom needs assessment tasks would take place. The proposal narrative indicates the "baseline analysis is also critical in that it lays the foundation of capacity for ongoing analysis of progress toward project goals." Four needs/gaps analysis areas are identified: 1) curriculum and instructional alignment with Common Core State Standards and personalized learning elements, 2) professional development of staff and leaders to implement personalized learning, 3) digital resources and technologies that support equity and access in and out of the classroom, and 4) unmet student academic and social emotional needs addressable by community partners and integrated student service providers.

While there is not a truly formalized plan for addressing this important inquiry into reform needs and gaps among the many

partners in this project, there is evidence that assessing needs and gaps has been thought through in an emergent way that can be advanced through the project. A weakness with this model, however, is that it is not clear whether partner stakeholders will buy into this task and/or have the capacity to undertake it well. A strength is that the PLE Facilitators will shepherd the process in each district. The primary weakness, however, is that this approach does not assess the current status of the reform vision and partners and that there is not a high-quality plan specifically focused on need/gap analysis.

C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	16

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

In this section, the applicant further fleshes out the curricular and data/learning management aspects of what it presented in the logic model/plan for its Full STEAM Ahead reform. The narrative states that it "regards goal setting (along with other activities to compile individual student data) as a foundation activity for personalizing the students' learning environment." It goes on to say, however, that the "teacher is at the core of linking each participating student's learning to such goals." This would seem to defeat, in part, the solicitation's desire to ensure that students have the tools to track and manage their own learning. On the other hand, this is evidence of the intended support and guidance for students by educators.

Overall, the applicant provides a compelling and forward-thinking vision for a personalized learning environment comprised of virtual and real "environments to identify and pursue college and career related goals." Age-appropriate digital and traditional resources are presented to students as part of this environment – including human resources in the form of parents, educators, college and career mentors, and members from Community Expert Partners. Students are expected to learn how to use these resources to identify engaging personal goals that interest them. A strength is the way that both classroom/school and community environments are considered integral to student interest and goal setting and how key people within the community (parents, etc.) are deputized – and formally trained and provided materials such as videos and discussion guides – to help students identify their personal interests and goals. Teacher professional development is key to the implementation of this strategy so that teachers can use the tools and strategies to help students refine personal goals and, more importantly, teachers can explain the goals and their rationales and approaches in the first place. The curricula and materials are to be aligned with the common core standards and their current college and career ready focus.

Another strength is the modules for what success looks like that are proposed for students so that they can visualize what a college and career ready goal might be and what it might look like in practice. The self-reflecting modules for students with high-needs are also unique and well thought-out. These modules are linked with college/career mentors as well as other adults in the community who can help students figure ways to implement them in their own lives. Again, professional development is key for adults involved as guides in this process as they gain skill with the general content of guiding students toward college and career ready goals and activities, but also use of the tools to document student learning goals, plans and progress (ostensibly in the data system–which is not mentioned).

Use of the flipped classroom model does support deeper and more personalized in class experiences and out of class experiences where students can guide their own learning. The proposal suggests that the online learning management system will be quite robust with significant resources and the ability to "promote robust online pointers and expert recommended/reviewed content" as well as opportunities for personal exploration by students alone or with parents or other adults. Again, professional development for teachers in how to understand these environments and how to use them pedagogically and from the perspective of data and progress monitoring appears as the key basis of this proposal.

Theoretically the proposal is excellent. In practice, however, it is unclear whether and how the learning management system (LMS) is, or will be, in place, for example. It says later in the proposal that the LMS will be launched in 2013. There is not a lot of indication about how all of these resources will be gathered, tagged, indexed, and set up in a system that makes them both accessible and "engagable." Part of this engagement is with diverse cultures, context and perspectives. The proposal highlights creating content based on Long Island's diversity and regional strengths as way to connect students to the people, cultures, and careers available to them on the Island. This kind of connection to place has great potential.

Again, professional development for teachers is proposed to help students extend learning in their classroom and engage them in multiple approaches to learning individually and in dynamic learning teams. Embedded coaching is a key aspect of this teacher support and is crucial for just-in-time guidance as teachers work to change their general understanding of, and approach to education. The in class coaching is a real strength and something that makes the proposal much more likely to be implemented well.

The Data and Learning Portal combined with the Student Trajectory Software should help students personalize their learning

and understand personal goals and goal paths. Then, using the web, these data can be made available to students, parents, educators and relevant others along with the classroom materials and assessments. Such systems do make independent, just in time, learning possible. The proposal suggests teachers will have more access to the classroom supports and tools for teaching, while parents will have more access to the tools for gathering information outside of the classroom. In terms of content, the proposal suggests that teachers will develop their own and it will be vetted to ensure it is high-quality and aligned with the common core standards and their focus on college and career readiness, as well as access to currently existing content resources. Here a process of vetting and categorizing materials is advanced. Also, professional development is intended to deepen teachers knowledge in their content areas and their skill as coaches as well as help them learn how to better access and use the technological resources available to them. The Logic Model does have projected outcomes such as A2S1 "All teachers will post at least one resource on the Learning Portal within three months of the beginning of the project." The logic model does not provide additional detail about how such material wil be reviewed, indexed, etc.

The proposal suggests that Full STEAM Ahead will participate in current NY Education Data Portal (EDP) implementation of a system to enter and track student data – and utilize 3rd party assessments -- now and as that project sunsets. Is not clear what this access would consist of outside of an attempt to get districts to also connect their data systems and there is no letter of support for this activity or work from potential partners – such as the State or one of its agencies – and/or the longitudinal data system more generally. This proposal suggests students will benefit from seeing possible career trajectories. Personalized learning recommendations are not mentioned. However, accommodations and training in high-quality strategies for high needs students so they know how to use the tools the service provided them and to track and manage their learning are proposed.

The applicants have thought a great deal about diverse parent/student needs and environments. It is a strength that this proposal sees parents as full partners and seeks to provide digital content to parents and students at their homes rather than have them walk in dangerous neighborhoods or at inconvenient times. Multiple languages are also considered. Here the applicants suggest providing key Digital content to parents on a thumb drive so they can access it at their leisure.

Overall, the applicant does present a fairly plan for improving learning and teaching of all students that is innovative and comprised of goals, activities, responsible parties, etc. – if one considers the logic model and its contents along with the information provided in this section. The efforts and materials envisioned would move curriculum and education in this consortium forward considerably by making it more personalized, engaging, and relevant through enhanced digital materials, student goal and interest driven curriculum, trained human guidance for student master, and the ability to be monitored in real time through multiple means. Also, the keen focus on professional development and training to support change in how educators think about the content and practice of what students need to learn for the future – and how they can learn for this future – is quite excellent since teacher perception is what often stands between the curriculum, the student, and his/her engagement with school and the world beyond. Because goals, activities, deliverables, reponsible parties and/or timelines, the proposed activities are not all evident in the Logic Model and/or accompanying narrative, the ideas and activities within do not constitute a "high quality" plan based on the USED definition. That being said, the vision and elements of the model are quite good.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	16

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

In the area of teaching and leading, the applicant presents elements of a high quality plan for improving learning and teaching at those times that it presents concrete goals and practices to advance the personalized learning environments for students' college and career preparedness. A key aspect of the teaching and leading approach is to develop significant tools to help online curriculum and instruction align to college and career ready standards and graduation requirements, and to effectively monitor student progress individually and as it rolls up at the building, district and state levels.

Evidence of elements of a high-quality plan of a personalized learning environment is presented as a combination of the pedagogical and technical tools premised on the following: a flipped classroom content creation and delivery model (made accessible by mobile and other digital devices); a mastery learning student achievement/learning model; and a networked, inter-connected and inter-operable, multi-level student data collection, analysis, and reporting model.

Evidence of plans for teachers, teams, and communities to engage in training and other types of development to enable the full implementation of personalized learning and teaching for all students is presented throughout the proposal. Professional development, especially for teachers, is a real cornerstone of this grant. The proposal narrative outlines the various professional development activities for teachers and other key grant stakeholders. PD coaches, data developers, Model School's professional developers and the personalized learning environment facilitators will be involved in workshops and turnkey trainings by experts in Personalized Learning Environments and the Flipped Classroom. Teachers are slated for a three-day Summer Institute as well as additional academic year training and job embedded support from these above-mentioned training/support personnel. Personalized learning environment facilitators are a key component of the grant as conceptualized because they will not only ensure professional supports to teachers in schools and classrooms, but will liaise

with building and district management to ensure implementation is moving forward smoothly. Another mechanism proposed by this plan to encourage training for the successful implementation of personalized learning environments is a layered "team" training and knowledge transfer approach where building teams send representatives to district teams which send representatives to regional teams which send representatives to Annual Advisory Board meetings. At each of these events people share best practices and identify solutions for improving the personalized learning environments and supports they are engaging in, with, and for students, while, at the same time, having an opportunity to consider midcourse corrections and sustainability scenarios for the grant itself. These are compelling elements that almost combine to form a high-quality plan.

Evidence of plans to measure student progress toward college and career ready standards or graduation requirements is provided in the various assessments and assessment scenarios discussed in the grant narrative. The grant proposes an initial individualized assessment of student learning styles through a proposed inventory (e.g. Let Me Learn Learning Connections Inventory) to help students and teachers understand more about students' individual learning styles. Formative assessments, benchmark assessments, summative assessments, daily informal assessments, authentic and portfolio-based assessments, are all offered as possible approaches to data collection relating to student progress toward career college ready standards and graduation rates. In addition, the proposed data systems–the anticipated Data and Learning Portal and the more newly formed Educational Data Portal (EDP) and P–20 Longitudinal Data System -- in conjunction with inventories such as the Let Me Learn Learning Connections Inventory-- create real time profiles and insights into student progress that can be used by students, educators, parents and others to more clearly identify student interests and, thus, target educational content and practice to these interests and personal goals.

There is stated, not empirical, evidence in the narrative of proposed plans for whether and how the teacher and leader evaluation would be used is to garner feedback for improving teachers' and principals' practice and/or for continuous district improvement. The applicant outlines a process of feeding back information about faculty input into student growth into the data systems. In addition, they outline a system of feeding such information back into core district teams for consideration and action such as the District Decision-Making Team (Data Team, Strategic Planning Team, Board Planning Team). These evaluations will be used to target individual professional development as well as determine which teachers are effective and highly effective. There is stated evidence, as well, of use of evaluation data to "enhance educator effectiveness, particularly in high poverty and high minority schools and the development of a plan to expand supports for ineffective and developing educators." The narrative states that NY's Office of District Services will take the lead on developing this process for LEAs. There is evidence of principal and teacher evaluation activities in the Logic Model relating to core assurance "C) recruiting, developing, rewarding, and retaining effective teachers and principals, especially where they are needed most," informing TIP and PIP resources and progress aligned with project goals, and prioritizing professional development offerings and supports.

As noted, professional development is a cornerstone of this grant and such professional development is proposed to take place in trainings and workshops as well as on-the-job through coaching and just-in-time supports. In the case of learning about the tools, data, and resources for accelerating student progress including actionable information to individualize learning approaches, high quality learning digital and other resources, and processes and tools to match to needs and provide continuous feedback, there is evidence in both the narrative and the Logic Model/plan.

The logic model does provide evidence of training goals/activities related to the use of tools data and resources to help them create effective learning environments for individual student needs and accelerated progress. There are specific performance outcomes indicated as well; for example, "at least 75% of participating teachers will report on an online survey that they have used at least one resource from the Learning Portal in their teaching with in the 1st 3 months of project participation." Another example is that, "at least 75% of teachers report that the used material from the Learning Portal will report on an online survey that the material help them personalize their students learning."

There is also evidence in the logic model/plan of access to actionable information, high-quality learning resources that are aligned to the common core standards and focused on career and college readiness, and processes and tools to match student needs. Specifically, establishment of the Data and Learning Portal is indicated along with outcome measures of teacher use of Learning Portal resources in their teaching. And, in the case of student use of data to manage and track their own learning, the Logic Model references the implementation and use of the Educational Data Portal Dashboard – the proposed data, planning and resource interface for students, parents and others.

In terms of the "training, policies, tools, data, and resources" to support effective personalized learning environments that meet individual needs and accelerate student progress, the narrative identifies mobile technology is the primary technology to be used in and out of class with the expectation that, out of class, students will be able to identify free local hotspots for Internet connectivity. In school connectivity is proposed as wireless, as well. As noted, above, and as evidenced in the logic model/plan, objective, activities, and outcomes measures for "B) building data systems that measure student growth and success, and inform teachers and principals with data about how they can improve instruction" professional development for teachers and leaders as well as training for students and parents and other community members in how to use the data systems and tools is a key building block of the proposed Full STEAM Ahead reform. There is not evidence in the Logic Model/Plan for ensuring more, and high needs students, receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers and principals. However, the narrative does specifically address this stating through the efforts of the Office of District Services as

noted earlier.

Overall, there is evidence of elements of a high-quality plan for teaching and leading that will improve learning and teaching by helping leaders understand their roles in helping educators learn to understand and use the tools and resources that support personalized learning environments for students so that they can progress toward college and career readiness and seek to graduate on time. There is not evidence, however, of a cohesive high quality plan.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	12

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

There is not evidence of a high quality plan resulting from the combination of the Logic Model/Plan and the narrative. Some goals, activities and deliverables, and responsible parties for key issues related to the successful execution of this Full STEAM Ahead grant are evident, but a comprehensive and cohesive plan for project support by policies and infrastructures is not.

In the proposal narrative, the applicant shares a well-conceived Full STEAM Ahead Consortium "4 tiered governance structure that will support personalized learning environments." Tier 1 consists of participating LEA Personalized Learning Environment Teams supported by a Personalize Learning Facilitator (PLEF). Tier 2 consists of regionally hosted User Group meetings and district-based Personalized Learning Environment Teams. Tier 3 consists of an Annual Advisory Board of higher-level participants including Eastern Suffolk BOCES, the Managing Partners, the PLEFs and representatives from the district–based Personalized Learning Environment teams. Tier 4 is the group of three Regional Directors/Project Manager, one for each BOCES partner. This 4 tier approach provides formal structures for input and feedback into the Full STEAM Ahead leadership and project. As well, this strong structure offers increasing levels of support and connection to the various organizational constituents.

Support for local flexibility and autonomy is evidenced in the narrative through this quote, "the Member Partners will be encouraged to customize Full STEAM Ahead to their district, school, and classroom needs, in alignment with all grant goals." To support customization, local control of "schedules and calendars, school personnel decisions and staffing models, roles and responsibilities for educators and non-educators, and school level budgets" is indicated.

There is not strong evidence for the ways in which students will be able to demonstrate mastery in multiple ways overtime. Both the logic model/plan and the narrative do not clearly conceptualize and/or communicate this particular proposed activity -- although it is crucial to the grant and the proposed learning, assessment, and content tools.

There is also not strong evidence of "learning resources and practices that are adaptable and fully accessible to all student's including students with disabilities and ELL." The needs articulated in the Logic model/plan and the narrative, but technical and programmatic responses are not clearly articulated outside of the generic notion that Full STEAM Ahead efforts will follow standard IEPs. No mention of the potential of assistive technology or new technologies for supporting personalized student learning of special needs and/or regular needs and/or ELL students is made -- which would seem particularly important for edcuational approaches that will utilze multi-media content in non-school settings.

	Available	Score
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	8

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The Full STEAM Ahead has evidence of a high quality plan for LEA and school infrastructure to support personalized learning in the goals and activities outlined in the proposal narrative but, specifically, in the timeline related to managing the first year of the project (with certain deliverables for years 2,3, and 4).

Specifically, by utilizing open source educational resources whenever possible as well as resources developed by teachers, community expert partners, and textbook publishers, students, teachers and parents all can gain access to the infrastructure and proposed content. The Data and Learning Portal is also accessible and open for teachers to develop lessons and work with student data and for students and parents to engage with lessons, access and feed back about student data, and utilize and export data in open and interoperable formats. The proposal says very little about the interoperability needs and capabilities of the student data systems – and this is a weakness. These systems comprise a core assurance area, and they require great technical and inter-organizational skill to get them to work effectively.

Students and teachers will be given the "tools" of mobile devices – individually and on school "carts." Wireless internet will be available in schools and students/parents will be made aware of hot spots within the community. The proposers suggest

many core educational materials will be advanced using video and other LT media streaming technology, but there is no discussion of potential bandwidth and/or infrastructure limitations. Out of school access and Internet speeds are crucial for the successful implementation of this proposed project.

Technical support is conceived of thoroughly in the proposal. For mobile devices, tech support takes the form of training, as product warrantee and support, and as just in time support for leaders and teachers (not parents/students). For the Data and Learning Portal, technical support will consist of training and just-in-time support. The high level of technical support for the use of technology and applications is crucial for the successful implementation of this project. The just-in-time support is particularly important because people are most receptive to learning, and can feel successful, when they do not understand something and are able to be shown how to solve it in real time.

Overall the proposal demonstrates an initial plan for infrastructure to support student learning in personalized settings; including the technical and learning needs of the educators, parents and other adults and/or peers who comprise the system. That the proposers provide a very specific timeline of implementation activities, dates, and key personnel is evidence of engagement and development of an initial implementation plan. That the plan does not fully address all of the issues, technologies, or activities that might need to take place to fully implement the project as intended would make sense at this early stage in the proposed reform project's life.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	14

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has identified a high quality plan for a process of continuous improvement that provides feedback on project progress so ongoing corrections can be made. Specifically, the applicant discusses its proposed continuous improvement process to monitor progress in the areas of "policy, management, resource allocation, professional development, evaluation and issues of overall effectiveness" using criteria of desirability, relevance, appropriateness, timeliness, responsiveness, effectiveness, and efficiency as it relates to the establishment and implementation of personalized learning environments.

The narrative discusses the evaluation methods and approach – and does a very nice job of it. Three evaluation domains are proposed: documenting progress toward established benchmarks and timelines; documenting the quality of specific program personnel, components and activities; and documenting the impact of program activities. The Program Evaluation Review Technique (PERT) project management tool will be used to track the project. Most importantly, the applicants provide a clear and concise evaluation plan that includes evaluation tasks and subtasks, responsible individuals, timing, and deliverables. The proposed tasks and intents are rigorous, appropriate and achievable.

Altogether this would constitute evidence is of very high quality plan for continuous improvement.

	Available	Score
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	5

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides an excellent overview of how it defines internal and external stakeholders, what different types of engagement and communication strategies it has in mind for each, and then very specific explanations of how it plans to communicate with each group of stakeholders. LEAs and educators, Full STEAM Ahead staff, external community stakeholders, and students are identified as key audiences with which to communicate. Specific strategies and venues for communication are identified (websites, radio, print, etc.) as well as large kick off events and larger and smaller meetings. In addition, different stakeholders are identified as best communication practice. For example, in communicating with students the applicants suggest that PLE Facilitators could work with teachers to help share the fact that the students/all are involved in a "change process" to encourage better student achievement and career and college readiness. Overall, the treatment of communication and engagement is thoughtful and thorough.

	Available	Score
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	1

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The narrative section and supporting documentation on performance measures is very confusing. The applicant has chosen to utilize this section as a place to discuss a more formal "evaluation plan" and process using a project evaluator. Yet, the criteria call for 12 to 14 performance measures, the rationale behind how they were selected, how the measure will provide rigorous information related to the theory of change, and how the measure will be reviewed and improved over time. The

performance measure tables are included in the application, but they are not clearly narrated and rationales for particular performance measures are not given. The following performance measures are evident in the tables, but the narrative does not address these particular measures explanatorily:

- the number and percentage of students with highly effective principles and teachers,
- number and percentage of students with effective teachers and principals,
- number and percentage of students at grade level proficiency into ELA,
- number and percentage of participating students at grade level persistency in math attendance,
- number and percentage of students suspended each year,
- number and percentage of students who commit violent and or disruptive acts
- number and percentage of students who are on track to college and career readiness,
- improvement in student on track performance percent of students to attain proficiency in New York State science assessment,
- percent of eighth-grade students who enroll in Regents level math forces, percent of eighth-grade students who enroll in Regents level science courses.

It would seem that the applicant has not fully met the criteria for this section and that the evaluation information provided, despite the fact that it is quite good, appropriate and thoughtful and relates specifically to the 4 core assurances, is inadmissible.

In terms of the performance measures set forth in the tables, there are many instances where the data seem incorrect or incomplete (e.g., Eastern Suffolk BOCES percent of participating students who attain grade level proficiency in ELA/Grade 7, number and percentage of students being taught by and effective of highly effective teacher). As a result, it is difficult to trust the numbers in the other tables. In general, projections seem attainable. However, the assumptions/rationales underlying each application of a percentage increase for all the provided performance measures are not provided, so it is difficult to assess their appropriateness and/or attainability at all.

	Available	Score
(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	5

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The evaluation plan provided is well thought out, tied to the Logic Model, and appropriate for guiding evaluative inquiry on the project using the assessments/indicators it identifies. Teacher professional development, activities that employee technology, partnership effectiveness and services provided to families are indicated as key evaluation inquiry areas.

When one reviews the evaluation plan, other evaluation areas are also present such as:

- common core standards integration
- type and frequency of postings to Learning Portal
- surveys to explore degree to which students report monitoring their own learning and/or student engagement

As noted earlier, many of the assessments rely on self-report data, which reduces findings' reliability and/or validity.

Overall, the evaluation plan proposed exceeds the intent of this selection criteria for this section in many positive ways.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	8

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The budget is broken into 4 different areas -- technology, professional development, governance and capacity building, and STEAM video. Within the overall budget narrative and the project level budget summaries all funds to support the project seem to be identified and accounted for. As well, all but a very few funds seem reasonable and sufficient to support the implementation of this Full STEAM Ahead reform project.

Throughout the budget and budget narrative a thoughtful rationale for investments and priorities is provided along with reference to specific pages within the narrative where more justification can be found. One-time investments and ongoing operational costs during and after the grant are identified and each narrative for the for project level budgets addresses sustainability strategies for their particular contributions to personalized learning environments to some degree.

There are a few areas where budget amounts and/or rationales are not clear.

In the professional development budget, it is not clear why the annual salary of the position of Professional Development coach and Model Schools Teacher Integration Specialist and Student Data Services Professionals Developers have annual salaries of $57,881, but the FTE is presented as 1.5FTE per year raising the salary to $86,821. This seems a bit high for the positions presented.

In the Governance and Capacity Building budget, contract costs are high, in part based on the salaries of the Local Evaluator and the Personalized Learning Environment Facilitators. Salaries for these positions need an additional justification. In this budget, as well, it is unclear why the Nassau BOCES Managing Partner support and Managing Partner Regional director are presenting compensation based on a per diem of $950 versus a fixed salary number. $950 per day seems a bit high for a government grant.

The Technology budget does a very nice job of breaking out and providing rationales for hardware expenses.

In the STEAM Video budget, funds for Model School Teacher Integration Specialists seem reasonably compensated. As in the previous budget, there is a question why the BOCES Model Schools Professional Developers command the $950 daily rate. Further justification of this rate is warranted.

Overall, the budget seems appropriate, reasonable, and sufficient for the proposed educational reform.

Note: the budget title says "Budget Requirements and Evidence for Selection Criteria (F)(1) and Optional Budget Supplement). There is no evidence of an Optional Budget Supplement.

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	3

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Despite the narrative statement that Full STEAM Ahead has a "high quality plan" for sustainability of the project goals after the grant's term ends, the proposed 5 steps do not constitute a high quality plan as defined by USED (e.g., with goals, activities, deliverables, timelines, responsible parties). The proposed steps do not include any assurances of future support from partners, the state or local government, or any other source. Potential for sustainability is premised on the establishment of structures, relationships, and sustained activities; for example, through the robust network of schools and CEP's that will be developed through the grant, or through the network of participating teachers and schools. While the 5 steps proposed are likely to help sustain Full STEAM Ahead, there is no substantive addressing of a number of key matters such as a) the salaries and professional development support provided by this grant at great expense -- $10 million for Capacity Building alone; b) the leagacy technology and content developed as a result of this initiative including the intellectual property attached to it.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	6

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

For the competitive preference priority, the applicant is proposing a broad-based partnership involving 20 community partners in an Integrated Family and Student Support Partnership. The wide range of organizations in this proposed partnership makes it possible to develop a regional resource to address the social emotional and other health and welfare needs of high risk and high need students and their families. The proposal is based on needs that were assessed through an analysis of demographic data with the assumption that "the majority of targeted school districts educate statistically more students who are members of minority groups, are poor, and experience higher rages of violence in their schools and communities," are not able to reach their potential as a result, and are typically well behind their NY peers. It is not clear whether the applicant intends these students, as described, to constitute the population intended in the notion of lowest achieving schools/students. The competitive preference priority proposes to provide professional development to these students and families and develop and implement integrated service action plans to reduce impediments to personalization of learning and, thus, improve college and career readiness.

The chosen population-level desired results for standards-based achievement are ELA and Math scores and the "on-track" measure. Student engagement measures are attendance and student surveys. Suspensions, and violent and disruptive incident reports will be the measures of improved student monitoring as a result of the project. Achieving success on these

measures requires both educational and family/community supports. The applicant proposes tracking self-monitoring and the "on track" academic performance measures through the Regional Information Centers' NY testing data warehouses and student engagement through online surveys Other assessment data are not discussed and there is not discussion of whether and/or how these systems will provide data as LEA aggregates and at the individual student level.

There is no evidence of how data will be used specifically to drive project work outside of a general process in which data are communicated during advisory meetings and other locales so that partners can explore it and advance strategies to meet the needs of the students and families in question by taking the group or groups most likely to be able to address the data-identified need. On the one hand, this will provide personalized supports. On the other hand, the lack of a clear and specific process could result in poor execution and outcomes. Note that to scale the model, it is proposed that additional partners will be sought annually–at least 5 per year--and they will create ad hoc action teams around identified issues in addition to doing their core work in the context of the grant. Finding ways to sustain this work through additional funding, the extension of education side of school, etc. will be a continuing task. There is no narrative addressing d) "improve results over time."

Needs will be assessed by school by cross walking schools' priority needs with services available by the Integrated School Services Partners. These authentic needs can be mobilized within the community and organizations able and willing to address them can get involved. Decision-making is conceived as taking place within an ad hoc group focused upon a specific school or community issue–the Partnership Action Team. This team is trained in consensus decision-making and will include representatives from families (non-negotiable) and community agencies and will be involved in analyzing data and proposing reforms to improve student outcomes.

This proposed competitive priority identifies community partners who can further support those Integrated School Support Partners who already support the targeted districts and populations. By way of evaluation, it is proposed that the Project Directors will assist the personalized learning facilitators in assessing the work while others continue to gather and explore data from Student Data Services and other data providers. A more formal evaluation plan is not discussed or alluded to.

Population-level desired results are provided along with Grade 3-8 performance measures. The latter shows evidence of annual ambitious yet attainable goals in the projections through 2016-2017. It is not clear why the tables only show performance measures of "percent attendance in participating schools" and "number of school suspensions reported to NYSDE" when additional performance measures were discussed earlier in the narrative. The population-level indicators are not presented with annual goals.   The desired performance attainment is achievable for the attendance and suspension measures. These do not seem overly ambitious.

The competitive priority is important because of the many excellent community and support organizations that can be mobilized to help advance student achievement and attainment of college enrollment or gainful employment. These organizations' social/emotional/behavioral supports can be advanced to not only support improved social and emotional skills, but to further support academic achievement. The applicant does not provide a strong formal plan regarding the competitive priority, how it will work, and with what results. It does, however, propose a bold vision of collaboration among a significant range of community partners to support schools and LEAs in their core work -- particularly for those youth who are disadvantaged in some way.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The applicant does an excellent job providing the history to show the way in which this Race To The Top–District competition builds upon the Race To The Top competition prior. The conceptualization and execution of this particular project – Full STEAM Ahead -- is premised on a three-pronged approach that, while it does not neatly map onto the 4 core assurances, does, in the end, meet the priority. Expert professional development in schools and classrooms, school-based personalized learning and personalized learning teams, and customized data and learning portals are the 3 legs of the Full STEAM Ahead stool. Turning around lowest achieving schools is addressed primarily in the logic model and evaluation table.

This project serves a large number of students – 20,844 -- along with 1036 classroom teachers and 48 leaders. As written, the proposal's 3 prongs/elements broadly map onto core assurances a) adopting standards and assessments that prepare students to succeed in college and the workplace and to compete in the global economy, b) building data systems that measure student growth and success and inform teachers and principals with data about how they can improve instruction, and C) recruiting, developing, rewarding, and retaining effective teachers and principals especially where they are needed

most. Treatment of core assurance D, turning around lowest achieving schools, is also addressed -- but not robustly.

More specifically, this particular proposal is focused primarily on implementing common core curriculum, teacher professional development, and building data systems Attention to core assurance 4 -- turning around lowest achieving schools–is not robust because the applicant has indicated that there are no "turnaround schools" per se in its sample. Thus, it is by considering whether or not there is evidence of support for low achieving schools and students that an assessment of addressing that core assurance can be made. Throughout the grant proposal the applicant does work to reach higher-need students, communities, and families -- the proxy, in this application, for lowest achieving/turnaround schools. Also, in the sections of the logic model and evaluation table that focus specifically on turning around lowest achieving schools, specific activities are proposed aimed at improving teaching and learning in poorly performing schools (i.e., PD using the turnaround models proposed in the NY RTTT Phase II grants, analysis of detention and suspension data, and support from the External Technical Assistance Center for Turnaround). Based on the premise that the proxy of low student achievement within a school even though it has not been deemed a lowest achieving school is appropriate, and on the evidence of some attention to turnaround in the logic model and evaluation table, the applicant's proposal does meet Absolute Priority 1. At the same time, more research and practical efforts regarding how to continue to refine what is known about the structures, strategies, tools, and other supports available to educators, parents, and business and non-profit leaders for turning around our lowest achieving schools is warranted.

In the approach to personalized learning presented by this applicant, the proposed personalized learning content (e.g..., flipped classroom, teacher/student developed work, standards-based) and data systems for tracking progress (longitudinal and local tied to curriculum and instruction) are appropriate to the task. The significant professional development in this project, for parents and community members as well as university teams, however, is the great strength. There are layers upon layers of professional development in support of the CCSS and academic achievement. The addition of the competitive priority, however, adds an entire dimension of social, emotional, and holistic support when so many community organizations are mobilized together toward targeted ends for a specific group of students and their families.

It seems that, on balance, the vision and plan for further designing, implementing and continuously improving Full STEAM Ahead will result in improved teaching and learning. The proposed personalized learning environment and, most importantly, the significant investment in developing the human resources to successfully communicate, shape, and utilize such a system within a Common Core Standards-based curriculum clearly meet core assurances A-C. Core assurance D is also met, as discussed above, albeit in a limited fashion.

Total	210	137

Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #1062NY-2 for Eastern Suffolk Board of Cooperative Educational Services

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	8

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

No discussion of student academic interests nor common and individual tasks.

Comprehensive and Coherent vision building on 4 core assurances:

Standards and Assessments: professional development and experience to prepare for Common Core, design instruction for personalized learning by supporting flipped classrooms

Data systems: educational data portal to share formative, summative and benchmark data, provide lesson bank

Great teachers and leaders: new principal and teacher evaluation system using student growth scores and local assessments, identify highly effective teachers and principals and offer incentives to mentor colleagues and transfer to high needs areas

Turnaround Low Performing Schools: technical assistance to improve student achievement, improved Vocational Ed services for students with special needs, network of and coordination of services, links with Higher Ed and assistance with Comprehensive District Education Planning Protocols.

Overall the Consortium demonstrates evidence of an extensive vision that is comprehensive and coherent in it's efforts to build on the four core assurances.   The vision, if fully implemented, will result in strong alignment with Common Core Standards and prepare students to be college and career ready. Access to data systems and a bank of lessons aligned to Common Core standards will achieve accelerated student achievement and deepen student learning. However, the Consortium provides limited evidence of a vision for providing personalization through common and individual tasks based on student academic interests.

(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	4

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

a. Lead LEA identified potential participating LEAs by prioritizing those with at least 40% free and reduced lunch and/or those in need of improvement as designated by the State of NY. LEAs with a track record of demonstrating improvement were also identified. Superintendents were then contacted and given information and invited to a half day information session. From there, Superintendents obtained support from their local stakeholders to sign on with the consortium. This inclusive process demonstrates an open call to LEAs who would meet RTT-D qualifications and who would be interested in participating.

b. A list of schools is provided by LEA. The RTT-D participation was limited to grades 3-8 however no justification is provided for this limitation. The consortium also included 2 charter schools in the application.

c. The consortium does meet the criteria of at least 40% of participating students from low income families. High need students are identified as those with a proficiency score of 1 or 2 on state Math or English assessments or designated as English Learner, disabled, homeless or low income. The number of educators and leaders is also identified.

Overall, the consortium provides evidence of how participating LEAs were selected. However, there is no evidence of how the participating LEAs then selected schools to participate. The overall data provided demonstrates that the consortium does meet the 40% low income participation requirement. High needs students are included and evidence is provided as to how they were identified. Grade bands are restricted to grades 3-8 however no justification for this limitation is provided. This indicates that schools and classrooms will participate on a voluntary basis and the project will not extend beyond these grade bands. Thus high quality LEA and school level implementation is not achievable. These concerns place the application in the medium low range.

(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	6

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

High quality plan for district-wide change: This application is for a consortium comprised of 18 LEAs within NY. Throughout the four years, information and updates will be provided to all LEAs within the NY area and, at the conclusion of the four year project, the consortium will offer a conference to publicize the results of the project and recruit additional LEAs.

Elements are a high quality plan are evident. Responsible parties are identified to collect information and disseminate it to other potential participants. Timelines are provided for relaying information and for scale up activities. Deliverables, in the form of methodology of circulating information, are given. However, the plan as detailed will not result in 'district-wide' change. Although this is a consortium applying, even after the four year grant cycle, the resulting reform program will only be available to LEAs and thus schools on a voluntary basis. Participation will remain limited.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	1

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Charts are provided for each school and participating grade level indicating baseline scores and target scores for each year of the grant. However, no information is provided to indicate how targets were determined or what assessment is being used for the measure. Numbers for each category and subgroup increase each year, however no information is presented as to what the numbers mean (raw numbers, % proficient, etc.). Charts are provided to demonstrate closing the achievement gap however again no narrative or labeling is provided to justify how numbers were determined nor what measure is being utilized.

Similarly, numbers are provided for a graduation rate and college enrollment but no information is given to explain how these rates will increase within the four year term when the students being served are in grades 3-8.

This application lacks a narrative to justify how targets were determined, lacks of information to interpret the numbers in the various charts and does not name measures used to assess targets. The consortium has failed to provide evidence that the Full STEAM Ahead reform will directly result in an increase in student performance thus the resulting goals are neither ambitious nor achievable and this criteria scores in the low range.

B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	1

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

a. Application describes partnership with Boards of Cooperative Educational Services and 11 districts. Details are provided to demonstrate how the BOCES provided technical assistance, professional development and monitoring to the district in the area of instruction of students with disabilities. However, no data is provided for the 18 LEAs in the consortium to demonstrate four years of success.

b. A partnership between a cooperative education service and 10 of Long Island's highest need schools is detailed. Application states that technical assistance was provided along with data analysis was provided and over a 10 year time frame, only three of the original 10 schools remain in Need of Improvement Status. No student level data is presented for any of the 18 LEAs included in the consortium.

c. New York has developed a Longitudinal Data System to provide a data warehouse for all districts within the state. Details are provided to justify how information is verified throughout the various levels within the program. However, no evidence is provided to suggest that educators then have access to that data to make data based decisions. The application states that 'most of the participating' LEAs have developed parent portals through third party vendors to allow parents access to data. Details are not provided to demonstrate what information parents have access to as the application states that determination is made on the basis of what is 'deemed locally important.'

Overall, the consortium does not provide any district level data for any of the 18 LEAs participating in the grant application. Therefore, a clear track record of success over a four year time period in regards to student achievement, graduation rates and college enrollment rates is undocumented. No evidence is provided to support ambitious and significant reforms occurred in low performing schools. There is also limited evidence regarding the availability of data to educators, as it is unclear as to their level of access to the data warehouse, and to parents and students as not all 18 LEAs have a parent portal. Therefore, this criteria scores in the low range.

	Available	Score
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	1

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

a-c: Application states that New York has a uniform reporting site that the public can access which lists salaries for teachers and administrators.

d. Application states that budget information is provided to the public during the yearly presentation of the school budget for approval.

Overall, this does not meet the intent of the criteria. The application does not provide evidence that school level data is made available for total salaries of instructional staff, support staff and teachers. Presenting the budget for approval provides information as to how money is intended to be spent. However, no evidence is provided to justify that actual expenditures from all 18 LEAs in the consortium is made available to the public. The application scores in the low range on this criteria.

	Available	Score
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	10

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The application is a consortium of 18 LEAs within the state of NY. A legal statute from 1992 is referenced to state that LEAs must establish school-shared decision making and involve stakeholder groups in planning and decision making at the building level. The NY Department of Education has two offices which would have oversight for the grant reform project, one which

would identify and support innovative projects and one which would provide expertise in the specific component of the proposal.

As justified by the evidence provided, the consortium demonstrates sufficient autonomy under state legal, statutory and regulatory requirements to carry out the three pronged approach as outlined in the vision consisting of professional development, personalized learning teams, and linking to a Data and Learning Portal.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	4

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

a. The grant proposal was developed by the designers of Full STEAM Ahead. LEAs were then approached to sign on as part of the consortium and stakeholder groups had the opportunity to provide input as to whether or not to sign on. However, no data is provided to suggest that the various stakeholder groups within the 18 participating LEAs had any input into the development of the proposal itself.

b. Letters of support provided: State Education Department, Town of Babylon, Town of Brookhaven, Town of East Hampton, City of Glen Cove, Town of Hempstead, Town of Huntington, Town of Oyster Bay, Town of Smithtown, Town of Southampton, Village of Southampton, Town of Southold, Village of Valley Stream, Nassau Board of Cooperative Educational Services, Western Suffolk BOCES, Evergreen Charter School, Freeport Public Schools, Glen Cove Schools, Patchogue-Medford Schools, Roosevelt Union Free School District, Uniondale Union Free School District, Valley Stream Union Free School District, Bridgehampton Union Free School District, Parent/Teacher Organizations, Community Expert Partners, and Integrated School Support Partners. No letters of support are provided from any student organizations.

Overall, there is no evidence to suggest that stakeholders from the 18 LEAs were engaged in the development of the proposal nor that the proposal was revised based on feedback from stakeholders. Rather, stakeholders for the LEAs were consulted as to whether or not to join the consortium as is. Extensive letters of support are provided, however no letters of support are provided from any student groups. This criteria rates in the low medium range.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	5

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

Overall, the application demonstrates the elements of a high quality plan as it relates to identifying needs and gaps of the applicant's current status. Responsible parties are named, both at the consortium level and the individual building level, to carry out an assessment within the first six months of the grant reform. Four specific areas are identified to assess and the logic model presented as a rationale for why these four areas were selected. This assessment will then form the baseline for the remaining grant activities and will reasonably result in the collection of the desired data.

C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	12

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

High quality plan for improving learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment in order to graduate college and career ready:

a. support of parents and educators

- i. Educators will work with students to set personal goals. Those goals will then be linked to instruction. Parents will be educated in goal setting and be expected to engage with their child in this process. Community resources will also be available in this process.
- ii. Digital resources will provide students and parents with models of proficiency and the ability to explore colleges and careers. This will then be utilized to help students set goals, align education to those goals, and monitor progress.
- iii. Applicant describes a flipped classroom in which all students share the common goal of the content to be learned at the base camp but the method and speed by which they make the accent will vary by student. Students will have the flexibility to self select online modules that are appealing to them. Applicant states 'there will be threads to deeper learning that can be managed by the teacher/guide.'
- iv. Community partners will provide exposure and access to diverse cultures, contexts and perspectives through online modules and mentorships. A focus will be on the history of Long Island with it's diversity and the students' place in the

community in the future.

- v. Educators will engage students in group activities that will promote growth in areas of teamwork, communication and character traits. Goal setting is the foundation of the reform project. Academic content will be delivered through the lens of personalized modules. Skills and traits such as perseverance, critical thinking, creativity and problem solving were not addressed by the applicant.

b. strategy to ensure access to:

- i. Aspects of the criteria such as personalized sequence of instructional content and skill development are not addressed by the applicant. However, applicant proposes to utilize the Data and Learning Portal and trajectory software to enhance knowledge of personal goal paths. Applicant states that data will be referenced with students and parents but does not provide evidence of how this will ensure students can graduate on time and college and career ready.
- ii. All students will have access to high quality resources both inside and outside of the classroom managed through webspace. Modules will be designed and preloaded for stakeholders. Educators will also have the ability to design their own modules as needed.
- iii. Digital content will be reviewed then indexed by subject area, grade level, standards and curriculum units. Educators will engage in professional development with community partners to deepen content area knowledge. Finally, partners will research outside available resources and provides links to those that are appropriate. No discussion is included to address how these resources will be aligned with college and career standards or graduation standards. However, since NY has adopted Common Core Standards and these resources will be aligned to the NY standards, one can conclude that all resources will address college and career ready standards.
- iv. Student data will be available through a dashboard and can easily follow a student from school to school. Teachers serving as coaches/mentors can help students develop e-portfolios and career plans. No evidence of a progress monitoring system is given to determine progress towards mastery of goals or graduation requirements. No mention is made of how personalized learning recommendations will be provided.
- v. The applicant addressed two specific needs for the population of students being served: the need to access digital learning from home and the need to make that learning accessible for non-English speaking families. However, no evidence of ways to address these needs is provided.

c. A three prong approach to providing training and support to students will be implemented. First, teachers will be trained in how to teach students the program. Second, training will be provided to both students and parents through open houses, conferences, and print media. Finally, how-to modules will be built into the system for 24/7 access.

Overall, the consortium demonstrates elements of a high quality plan to address improved teaching and learning by personalizing the learning environment. Key goals are provided that have the ability to provide greater personalization through the concept of a flipped-classroom. Research is referred to show how this concept and the digital tools provided will increase personalization and increase student achievement. The deliverables and responsible parties are identified at the consortium level however timelines are not provided. Additionally, the consortium identifies barriers to the plan for high needs students but does not offer solutions to address the barriers. The applicant also provides limited information as to how the digital resources will be linked to specific students to allow them to deepen learning in their areas of interest. These key concerns place this criteria in the middle range.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	12

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

High quality plan for leading and teaching to improve instruction and increase capacity to support student progress towards goals by fully implementing personalized learning environments:

a. educators engage in training, professional teams

- i. Year 1: 3 day summer institute for initial training, follow up job embedded professional development throughout the year provided by coaches and managed at the building level. Year 2-4: similar professional development with emphasis on assessment measures. Additional professional development will be provided as needed to achieve project goals.
- ii. Students will engage in an assessment to determine learning styles. With this information, teachers will develop classroom activities to include discovery learning, discussion and debate, collaborative activities, experiments, coached problem solving, videos, audio files, interactive simulations, etc. Class time will be utilized to focus on college and career readiness and content learning will primarily occur outside of school utilizing the digital devices provided with assistance from parents, guardians and siblings.
- iii. Utilizing the Data Portal, educators will have access to demographic data as well as summative and benchmark data. Teachers can then create their own formative assessments and upload lessons and resources. Student historical

data is embedded with information regarding progress toward college and career goals. These are the data available for all students, not only those participating in the grant. Comparing participating students with those not participating will allow for data analysis regarding the effectiveness of grant activities.

- iv. As NY is a RTT state, the state as a whole has adopted a system of identifying and retaining high quality teachers and leaders. This includes monitoring student growth on multiple measures as well as utilizing classroom observations. The coaches included in this grant proposal would assist building leaders in providing input into the evaluation system and providing feedback and supports to participating teachers.

b. educators have access to:

- i. Teachers will be given professional development and coaching in the areas of personalized learning, learning styles, flipped classrooms, data analysis and common core standards. They will use this knowledge to identify optimal learning approaches that respond to student needs. They will also be provided data and resources through the data portal.
- ii. High quality learning resources will be provided in the areas of both instructional content and assessments. In terms of instructional content, experts and coaches will align resources to Common Core standards which are in turn aligned with college and career readiness. These resources will both be mined from existing resources and developed by local teachers and experts. Resources will include career videos, video conferencing, and real student success stories. Assessments will include learning style inventories, standardized testing, benchmark testing, formative assessments, and qualitative assessments to measure student attitude and engagement.
- iii. Evidence related to a process to match individual student needs with resources is vague. The applicant reiterates that professional development and ongoing coaching will be provided to participating educators in the area of data analysis. However, no details are provided to demonstrate a link between this training and decision making regarding appropriate resources for students.

c. Leaders and leadership teams:

- i. Applicant states that all LEAs utilize the teacher and principal evaluation system designed by New York which incorporates items such as student growth data and classroom observations. Many, but not all, participating LEAs also have district-decision making teams to ensure the district and schools stay on target and are aligned with goals. However, no evidence is provided to demonstrate how the teacher and principal evaluation system and other sources are utilized to assess and take steps to improve effectiveness and school culture and climate for the purpose of continuous improvement.
- ii. This year NY is fully implementing a new process of Annual Professional Performance Review to continually analyze student growth resulting in a laser-like focus on student growth and trajectories, instructional support, data support and improvement plans. Through professional development and coaching, the applicant will assist in increasing the capacity of educators and leaders to change existing norms and practices.

d. High Quality plan for increasing student access to effective and highly effective teachers and principals: New York is in the process of correlating teacher and principal evaluation scores with student growth scores to determine where educators are evaluated as effective and highly effective but do not have corresponding student growth numbers. The applicant will then provide tools and resources to those leaders and educators to improve their effectiveness and build capacity. Data will be disaggregated to determine equitable distribution of effective and highly effective educators. No discussion is provided as to how those subgroups or schools with a low percentage of effective and highly effective educators will be addressed other than to provide tools and resources to build effectiveness.

Overall, the consortium provides evidence of key elements of a high quality plan for improving teaching and leading to improve instruction and increase capacity to support students in meeting college and career standards. Details of extensive professional development, coaching and mentoring are provided along with timelines for training and the responsible parties for providing each stage of the professional development. Tools and resources will be made available that have been reviewed by experts and coaches and aligned to Common Core Standards. However, limited evidence is provided as to how these resources will be matched to individual student need. Leaders will have access to a teacher evaluation system that incorporates measures such as student growth however, no measures are identified to address culture, climate and continuous improvement. Finally, New York is developing a system of identifying effective and highly effective educators and principals, however evidence of a high quality plan to increase student access to these educators in hard to staff areas is lacking. Therefore, the applicant scores in the middle range on this criteria.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score

(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	3

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

High Quality Plan to support project implementation:

a. The consortium has developed a four tiered governance system that provides for support for each LEA and building within the grant. Meetings of various tiers will occur monthly, quarterly and annually depending on the tier but all will focus on best practices, identification of issues and solutions, planning for further activities and building local capacity.   A Regional Director will be charged with managing implementation. Personalized Learning Environment Facilitators will provide day to day direct facilitation and provide a direct communication link to the Regional Director.

b. Each LEA will have the flexibility, as given by the consortium, over factors such as school schedules and calendars, school personnel decisions and staffing models, roles and responsibilities for educators and non-educators, and budgets. The Personalized Learning Environment Facilitators will assist LEAs to weave together individual needs of schools and classrooms with the reform grant framework. The flexibility and autonomy of each individual participating school is not addressed by the applicant.

c. No evidence is provided to demonstrate the opportunity to progress or earn credit based on demonstrated mastery. Rather, the applicant states that as a result of the focus on STEAM courses, the number of students taking Regents courses at earlier grade levels will increase.

d. No evidence is provided to demonstrate the opportunity for students to demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times and in multiple ways. Rather, the applicant states that students will have access to resources both inside and outside of the classroom and will be afforded the opportunity to interact with curriculum in a variety of ways.

e. The applicant states that resources will be fully accessible through the use of free translation tools and that all teachers will continue to follow students' IEPs.

Overall, the consortium fails to provide evidence of a high quality plan to address comprehensive support through practice, policies and rules that facilitate student learning. The consortium demonstrates a robust governance structure with responsible parties and timelines that would support participating LEAs and provides the LEAs with flexibility and autonomy over school structures and decision making. However, no plan is in place to address students progressing and earning credit based on standards mastery nor a plan to allow students to demonstrate standards mastery in multiple ways at multiple times. The applicant states that educators will continue to follow a student's IEP plan however this does not provide evidence that the resources provided, particularly in a flipped classroom in which content work will be completed outside of the classroom, will be fully accessible to students. Overall, the consortium scores in the high-low range on this criteria.

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	2

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

High quality plan to support project implementation with LEA and school infrastructure that supports personalized learning by:

a. All teachers and principals participating will receive IPads. Schools will receive IPad carts and all other supporting technology to support the grant in proportion to the number of students participating. Schools will be encouraged to set up a process to allow students to take devices home and to provide parents with a list of places in the community that offer wi fi access. However, the applicant does not state that all students will be provided a device to take home daily and wi fi access will be problematic for families who are unable to access wi fi in the community.

b. All teachers and principals will receive training on using the devices and using the programs on the devices. Just-in-time training will be provided as needed. The applicant states that students are digital natives and come to the classroom very able and willing to use technology and that each LEA will bring an awareness of the project and technology to the parents. While the training suggested for teachers and principals is sufficient, the training and technical support proposed for parents and students is not sufficient to ensure proper utilization of the device and the resources it contains.

c. Instructional content resources will be in an open data format that can be accessed from any internet browser or utilizing common software programs such as adobe or Microsoft word. Data in the Data Portal is web based and uses a permission system to maintain FERPA compliance. It is unclear if this data will be accessible in an open format.

d. All LEAs and partners utilize interoperable data systems for human resources, student information and financial systems.

Overall, the consortium fails to detail a high quality plan to ensure that all stakeholders, regardless of income, have access to the necessary tools. While teachers and principals will be provided IPads and schools will have IPads that can be sent home, there is no evidence of a plan that would provide for each student to have a device to take home nor to have internet access once they are home. The districts are expected to provide a list of community internet access points, however earlier in the

application, it was stated that some families have transportation issues and in some areas its not safe for the kids to be out after dark. Therefore, not every student will be able to access internet at home as is necessitated by the flipped classroom model. Additionally, while training and technical support is comprehensive for teachers and principals, it is limited for students and parents. The consortium provides evidence that resources related to content will be in an open data format but it is unclear if data from the Data Portal will be available in an open format. The criteria for interoperable systems is met by the consortium. There are concerns on three of the four criteria in D(2) and no plan is detailed to remedy these limitations. Therefore, the consortium scores in the low range on this criteria.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	13

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The consortium has identified an extensive structure for continuous improvement. For each program activity, a measure of progress has been documented along with the timeline for administering the measure, a process for analyzing the results and a methodology for implementing any course corrections. The feedback loop as presented is timely. The resulting information from this process will be available to those within the consortium on the Full STEAM Ahead website but no mention is made of how the results will be made available to the public on the quality of investment.

	Available	Score
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	5

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has identified four sets of stakeholders with whom communication is key: the LEAs, Full STEAM Ahead staff, external stakeholders, and students. The nature of the communication will vary with each group as the communication needs of each group are different. Evidence is provided to demonstrate that the consortium has developed multiple methods to communicate with each group in a manner that is timely and allows for input. Timelines are presented and the staff members responsible for initiating the communication are named. Overall, the consortium demonstrates evidence of a high quality approach to engaging stakeholders in communication throughout the grant.

	Available	Score
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	1

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The RTT-D grant application has been submitted by a consortium of 18 LEAs. The goals of the grant reform are to provide professional development to the LEAs and build capacity through a Data and Lesson Portal to personalize learning in a flipped classroom format. The measures provided in the application respond to the stated goals of the grant. However, the measures listed are not ambitious nor achievable as targets are not given for end values on the measures.

School level measures are provided. However, no data is given on baseline or target values for all students in terms of access to effective and highly effective teachers and principals. As the grant proposes to serve students in grades 3-8, the additional measures that are required include one age appropriate measure of academic growth, one grade appropriate indicator of health or social-emotional growth, and one measure of the students who are on track for college and career readiness. Each LEAs proposes to utilize the NY state assessment as a measure of academic growth at each grade level. Baseline and target data is given for each school and each grade level however there is no discussion as to how those targets were determined and the targets and growth vary significantly from district to district. Each school provides baseline and target scores for school attendance rates, out of school suspension rates and percent of students who commit violent acts. These, however, are not disaggregated by subgroup. No explanation is provided for these indicators so the assumption is that these are being utilized as measures of health and social-emotional growth. Charts are included for each school for the number and percent of students who are on track to college and career readiness however no explanation is provided to indicate what measure is being utilized to determine these values. An additional chart is provided to provide a pre-post comparison in the percent of students who attain grade level proficiency in both ELA and Math on the NY state assessment. Charts are also provided to show target increases in the percent of 8th graders enrolling in a regents courses.

Overall, the consortium scores in the low range on this criteria. Performance measures are provided that are appropriate for the population selected however, no data or targets is provided for increasing access to effective and highly effective teachers and principals. Each LEA provided baselines and targets for the appropriate measures, however no discussion of how targets were set is provided and the targets vary widely between LEAs and thus it is unclear if these targets are ambitious and achievable for each LEA. Finally, measures of heath and social-emotional growth are not disaggregated by subgroup.

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	3

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Plans to evaluate the effectiveness of the efforts of the consortium center around the administration of survey instruments. Teachers will be surveyed to determine the effectiveness of professional development activities. Parents will be surveyed to determine if services meet their needs. It is stated that the technology will be evaluated with respect to it's effectiveness although no evaluation measure is provided for this activity. Applicant states that the bottom line in terms of evaluating effectiveness will be determined by the increased number of students meeting and exceeding Common Core Standards and graduating college and career ready.

Overall, the provided plans for evaluating the effectiveness of the project center around qualitative measures and obtaining feedback on stakeholder opinions. This will provide limited information on the effectiveness of RTT-D activities.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	10

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Budget includes:

a. all funds used to support the project: The awarded grant will go to fund the Full STEAM Ahead staff and required technology. Those staff will in turn manage the consortium and provide all professional development. LEAs will continue to pay salaries and benefits of the educators participating in the grant. Additionally, the provided technology and professional development is intended to supplement not supplant what is currently offered in each LEA.

b. reasonable and sufficient: Funds proposed are reasonable and sufficient. Costs were based on current educational market value and salaries will be fixed prior to the hiring of staff. Funds are specified for each of the four years and will result in sufficient funds to carry out all grant activities.

c. thoughtful rationale for investment: no other funds are named as supporting the grant reform other than to state that this is intended to supplement what is currently available to the 18 LEAs. It is assumed that each LEA has other funds that will support the project but they are not specified. Technology costs are mostly a one time investment cost with the cost of staffing and professional development being continuous over the four year period. At the end of the grant, the consortium asserts that sufficient capacity will have been built to carry on with the partnerships and professional development to extend the reform to other educators.

Overall, the consortium demonstrates sufficient and reasonable plans to utilize grant funds as a supplement to LEA budgets. Costs are broken out into one time investments and ongoing costs with plans to extend the knowledge to additional educators at the end of the four year grant.

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	2

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The consortium cannot guarantee additional financial support for the grant project after the four year grant term expires. However, they anticipate that the federal, state and local governments will see the benefits of creating personalized learning environments and continue to support this initiative after the grant. They also anticipate that local LEAs will see the benefits and begin allocating money in the direction of professional development and technology to add to the momentum. The capacity built in educators and partnerships will not be lost at the end of four years and the expectation of those participating is that they will continue to share their knowledge and expertise at the end of the grant cycle.

Overall, the consortium demonstrates thoughtfulness in building stakeholder ownership of the project and providing momentum to continue at the end of the grant cycle. However, elements of a high quality plan to ensure continuation is lacking. No evidence is provided to suggest who maintains ownership of components of the project once the grant expires such as the Data and Resource Portal and the technology and servers distributed to the LEAs. Likewise, no data is provided to demonstrate what happens to the Full STEAM Ahead consortium at the end of the four year term. Timelines for phasing out the consortium, if that is in fact what is planned, are not provided nor are responsible parties identified to provide for the transition of intellectual and real property. Therefore, the consortium scores in the low range on this criteria.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	2

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

Integrate public or private resources into a partnership designed to augment the school's resources by providing additional support:

1. coherent and sustainable partnership to support Absolute Priority 1: Full STEAM Ahead has assembled a broad-based partnership including: Epilepsy Foundation, ESPERANZA Project, FEGS Health and Human Services, Family & Children's Association, Hispanic Counseling Center, Long Island Center for Independent Living, Long Island Consortium of Homeless Support Services, Crisis Center, McKinney-Vento, Migrant Education Outreach, Child and Family Guidance Center, Bilingual Education Resource Network, Special Ed Technical Assistance Support Center, Comprehensive Behavioral Health Consortium, Struggling to Reunite our Generation, Student Assistance Service, Prevention Resource Center, and Independent Living Organization. The proposed project will link districts to services in their communities through the partnership with those listed. Evidence as to how students and families will be linked to the appropriate resource is not provided.

2. not more than 10 population level desired outcomes: The outcomes listed are the same as those listed in Absolute Priority 1. Data will be gathered on student achievement, student engagement and behavioral measures. No evidence is provided to link the partnership proposed to these indicators and measures.

3. Track indicators and measure results: utilizing the data warehouse, the data from the measures listed above will be mined. Use of data to target resources: data will be shared at monthly advisory meetings and partners will determine areas of need, partners will then engage community resources to host professional development or workshops to address issues or subpopulation needs. Strategy to scale the model beyond participating students: initial list of partners is not meant to be finite, partnerships will continue to grow and be sustained during and following the grant. Improve results over time: not addressed by applicant.

4. describe how partnership would integrate education and other services: sponsor ad hoc action teams of partners and schools to provide integration of materials, personnel and expertise in the education setting and to extend education outside of school.

5. build capacity:

- a. address needs and assets- bring awareness of available resources to the school and classroom level, partners invited to participate in professional development
- b. identify and inventory needs and assets- project director will cross walk each school's priority needs with services available
- c. decision making process- an ad hoc action team, focused on a specific school/community issue, will utilize a consensus model of decision making, team will include parents, teachers, administrators, and community agencies
- d. engage parents and families- parents will be a non-negotiable constituency in all action teams and will be familiarized with a Synectics based process of planning to maximize input from all stakeholders, including parents
- e. routinely assess progress- a group of service providers will be identified to train staff in group problem solving and conflict resolution; director will work with a professional developer to determine if additional data in the areas of behavior and social aspects may need to be collected and how to incorporate that into the data tool

6. Annual ambitious yet achievable goals: Goals provided include improving resource deployment, increasing student achievement scores, increasing the number of participating partners, decreasing violent behaviors and suspensions, increasing attendance rates, student engagement rates and parent satisfaction rates. However, baseline and target percentages are only provided for attendance and suspension rates. The other measures have no data associated with them nor are annual targets set.

Overall, the Competitive Preference Priority scores in the low range. Population level desired results are vague and ambitious yet achievable goals are not expressly stated for the desired results. Evidence as to how the partnerships will benefit students and families directly is limited. Rather, the consortium focuses on the partners providing professional development and workshops in order to increase awareness of the resources available to families.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	**Met/Not Met**	**Met**

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The consortium demonstrates how 18 LEAs will build on the core educational assurance areas to create learning environments that are designed to improve learning and teaching through the professional development and implementation of a flipped classroom system.. This system will adequately provide access to resources and educational experiences that are aligned to college and career ready standards and will prepare students to succeed in college and the workplace. Students will be provided the opportunities to accelerate and deepen their learning by the flipped classroom system guiding them to educational experiences that will increase access to career awareness and peer models. The Data and Resource portal system will provide educators will access to longitudinal data as well as resources linked to Common Core Standards thereby allowing educators to make student learning more relevant. Performance measures are provided by the consortium but some measures are not disaggregated by subgroup and there is no clear rationale as to why those measures were selected nor how growth targets were determined. As the proposal targets only students in grades 3-8, limited conclusions can be drawn as to how the reform proposal will increase graduation rates of students who are college and career ready as there is not evidence of a plan for continuing personalized learning for these student as they enter high school. New York is beginning to collect data on effective and highly effective educators, however the consortium does not address how student access to these educators will be increased in high need areas. However, overall, the consortium does demonstrate evidence of meeting the components of Absolute Priority 1.

	Available	Score
Total	**210**	**105**

Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #1062NY-3 for Eastern Suffolk Board of Cooperative Educational Services

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	10

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

This Long Island, NY consortium presents a complete and coherent vision for reform. Calling its RTTD project Full Steam Ahead, this group reports that it has fully embraced New York State's reform vision outlined in Race to the Top Phase II. The applicant address standards and assessments by stating that it adopts Common Core State Standards for English, language arts, and mathematics. It addresses the assurance regarding the use data in a myriad of ways which are all intended to result in improved achievement among students. The applicant informs that data use will help teachers draw on best practices. Data will also be used to make decisions about how to differentiate instruction. Administrators will reportedly use data to inform teacher recruitment, evaluation, and differentiated professional development. Data will help the schools have an Early Warning System to help identify at risk students and keep them on track for graduation.The applicant intends to revamp professional development. The applicant further addresses teaching and leading by submitting that providing teachers and principals with "clinically rich preparation" is a central focus of the effort to ensure effective leadership and instruction, particularly in STEM. The applicant addresses the assurance about turning around persistently low achieving schools by stating it is willing to adopt whichever intervention model is best suited to local need and capacity. Personalized learning is addressed by the applicant stating that they will approach personalization through changes in curriculum, instructional methods, technology, use

of time and use of data. The applicant provides a logical model supporting its theory of change .

(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	7

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The Full STEAM Ahead (NY) project describes its participating schools as 49 schools serving elementary through high school students. Twenty-nine schools are elementary/intermediate. Nineteen are middle/junior high schools and two are charter schools. All are in Suffolk and Nassau counties in New York. In all, Full STEAM Ahead anticipate serving 20,844 students in grades 3-8. Of this total 11,846 (the equivalent of 56.83%) are students from low income families based on free/reduced lunch criteria. This percentage is above the 40% minimum required by the RTTTD Notice.

The number of high need students represented by the number of students with a proficiency score of 1 or 2 on either statewide Math or English Language Arts assessment or who are designated as Limited English Proficient, and/or Disabled, and/or Low Income, and/or homeless. In the selected schools and grades, 1,036 teachers and 48 school leaders will be involved. To arrive at these selections the lead LEA, consortium managing partners from Western Suffolk, Eastern Suffolk, and counties discussed a regional approach to creating personalized learning environments. These non-rural areas had a high number of eligible schools to consider and narrow for inclusion in the manageable RTTD project.

This consortium elected to focus upon eligible schools serving grades 3-8. The partners looked for schools whose shared commitment to the required personalized learning environments required by the grant notice, district demographics and level of need, and their ability to comply with required assurances was apparent. Of this narrowed group all were invited to participate in a 1/2 day conference. Information packets containing a RTTTD overview, a copy of the assurances, and a sample memorandum of agreement were provided to potential participants prior to this conference where further support was garnered and personnel to guide ongoing project planning were identified. The names of all 49 participating schools, including qualifying eligibility information and other numeric information is presented in Table A(2) of this section of the application. The narrative response and the table stop short of addressing how the students, their schools, grade levels, etc. will contribute to the success of the plan. Not enough clarity is provided for why grades 3-8 were chosen as the selected grade spans versus the other grade spans that could have been chosen. Little is said about the expected impact of the effort on individual students.

(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	9

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Full STEAM Ahead and its managing partners assert that they are focused on extending their vision of reform to establish personalized learning environments throughout the entire Long Island region. Their plan to achieve this goal is identified in the response to (A)(3) commencing with project implementation.

Their plan involves a 5 step process outlined below from their response:

1. Activities and Lines of Communication to inform all LEAs regarding progress of Full STEAM Ahead - to include a website, comprehensive newsletter and a schedule of ongoing conferences with education stakeholders
2. Utilization of information from District Teams - to involve a team from each LEA comprised of teachers, administrators, parents, community personnel, and students who will meet monthly to assess progress and discuss activities, issues, and challenges to implementation. Issues deemed to be relevant to the recruitment process will be taken into consideration for scale up activities.
3. Utilizing key personnel with LEAs to assist in scale up activities - Regional Directors and Personal Learning Environment Facilitators who are responsible for being liaisons will identify personnel who were instrumental in establishing participating LEAs as early adopters and those who oversee day-to-day operations of the project at each school. These personnel will then identify teachers who have expressed project interest. The managing partner personnel will work cooperatively with key LEA staff in outreach to principals of other buildings to establish communication lines and opportunities to expose teachers to the grant activities and project successes. These activities will culminate in the final year of the project with the selection of additional teachers in participating buildings and additional buildings of participating LEAs.
4. Identifying Participating Teachers Who May Serve as Master Teachers or Scale Up Activities - to involve managing partner personnel using data to identify teachers who have demonstrated exceptional ability to establish personalized learning environments in their classrooms. Those identified will receive professional development during Year 4 to assist in training and coaching teachers who will participate as part of scale up activities.
5. Conducting an all region conference to recruit additional LEAs for participation in the Project Scale UP - to involve a conference for all non-participating LEAs to present project goals, achievements, roles and responsibilities of LEAs

focused on recruitment of additional LEAs in the Long Island region to expand to other schools and students in need.

Other than the activities to be addressed from the yearly or monthly perspective, no incremental time interval(s) is/are identified in the narrative (i.e. a timeline is absent). The delineated information above is evaluated quality because it addresses most key elements of high quality identified in the notice.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	3

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

ESBOCES' Full STEAM Ahead! project presents a series of tables showing baseline data and goals for each sub-criteria, a-e, in the requirements. **There is no narrative information provided for section (A)(4). What is not included in the tables is any information restating the project goals, regarding the names of summative assessments used to rate proficiency status and growth, the process used to establish the anticipated goals, the methods and strategies to be used to achieve decreases in achievement gaps, the strategies intended to raise graduation rates and rates of college enrollment. The omission of this information in this section results in a greatly reduced evaluation rating. It is not possible to identify or evaluate how student learning and performance will be improved or how equity will be increased without these important elements being addressed in the applicant's response.** The overall goal to increase student achievement by reducing the existing gaps between subgroups is likely to be the result of improved student learning. To close the performance gaps between the subgroups should be an indicator that more attention to these students' needs/ equity is linked to the performance changes within these groups.

B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	7

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant's response to this section touts a longstanding relationship between Boards of Cooperative Educational Services and the districts partnering in this consortium dating back to 1948 . They report that this lasting relationship has yielded positive outcomes such as in sharing and linking resources and broad and improved professional development.The applicant reports a record of regional success in student learning. **However one is left wondering about the success of individual school districts within this group**.

Provided as one example of success is a 2011-2012 project called Regional Special Education Technical Assistance Support Consortium which served 11 Suffolk County and 8 in Nassau County. Each had the federal designation of being a School in Need of Improvement, a Corrective Action School, or a school in need of Restructuring. With the personnel assistance and resources of this project put in place the result was 14 of the total 19 schools are no longer in those accountability statuses. Regarding making student performance data available to students, educators and parents in ways that inform and improve, the applicant points to the evolving Longitudinal Data System that includes data that matches to all federal NCLB reporting requirements which that has been implemented in New York. Most of the districts that are a part of the Full STEAM Ahead project are reported to have developed systems to provide access to parents and students in the form of parent portals. This is the presented evidence that the professional development work done as part of this initiative resulted in success. The application reports that there are no "persistently lowest achieving schools" on Long Island. There are low performing schools.

The response includes no specific goal information, no evidence of clear success over the past 4 years by district and no information about improving student learning outcomes and closing achievement gaps other than to say "the proposed project will build upon relationships that districts already have with BOCES staff and services link with already-existing networks of partners that provide services to meet the myriad of needs of their students". **Graphic displays such as tables or charts indicating a clear record of success of the consortium members were not provided by the applicant.**

(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	4

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant's response to (B)(2) informs that the participating LEAs "makes this information accessible to the public, including local press, parents, and other stakeholders". The applicant further reports that these groups of stakeholders are directed to a uniform reporting site called SeethroughNY.net. **This site is reported to contain individual teacher and administrator salaries for all NY schools.** The applicant also provides a statement that reports that information about LEAs' use of funds, school level expenditures for k-12 instruction--instructional and non-instructional salary costs, instructional supplies and support, equipment and school administration costs are routinely provided to the community in the yearly presentation provided to the community during the presentation of the school budget for approval. No graphic evidence providing an example of SeethroughNY.net's reporting capability or what is provided to the public in yearly budget meetings is included in this section though they do meet the requirement of (B)(2) which says "at a minimum, this information must include a description...". **It is not clear if the data is also available (with totals reported) by school as required in a-d in the (B)(2) criteria.**

(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	8

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant uses the New York State Education Department's core belief about every child's ability to learn, the department's past history of that commitment to reform activities, and the state's status as a Race to the Top award recipient as evidence of the existence of successful conditions already being in place. RTTT provides flexibility to focus on innovation and with NY being a recipient of the earlier grants this extends to the applicant in evidencing successful conditions being already in place.

The applicant's response points to Title 8 ESEA legislation dating back to March 1992 to show that there is a history of creating authority in statute. In the 1992 legislation LEAs were required to adopt plans to establish school-based shared decision making. Through implementing these requirements, the applicant reports that school based planning teams were given the authority and autonomy to decide which educational issues will be subject to cooperative planning and shared decision-making at the building level along with the degrees of involvement of stakeholders and the accountability processes.

They close this section's response discussing the 2010 Office of Innovative School Models, the existence of the External Technical Assistance Center for Innovation and Turnaround , and two New York state offices that support issues concerning personalized learning as additional evidence of sufficient autonomy and conditions under state legal and statutory requirements.

No mention is made of specific portions of state legislation that discuss the granted authority and autonomy or of any particular identified circumstance that having this authority and autonomy has allowed participating schools who are part of this effort to address.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	8

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

In the begriming of this section, the applicant identifies multiple groups of stakeholders (including parents, teachers, administrators, business leaders, university staff, and students) who serve on a range of committees and advisory boards to study and make recommendations related to curriculum, instruction and school safety for the LEAs. For this RTTD effort, the also reports that surveys and focus group interviews were done. LEAs in participating in this partnership have collective bargaining according to the applicant's response. They report that this unit engaged its teachers in the process to discuss the application. A MOU containing the signature of representative of the collective bargaining unit is provided as evidence of support from teachers. Letters of support from a range of the groups and individuals that are a part of the (B)(4) criteria to assess the extent that there was meaningful involvement are included in the appendix. This stated information and the letters are assessed to be a demonstration that the applicant had sufficient evidence of meaningful stakeholder engagement and support. The only obvious omission noted is the lack of information about if there were suggestions for revisions to the proposal and if so how they were handled.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	2

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant includes in the response 4 areas where needs and gaps have been identified: curriculum and method alignment, professional development needs, equity in digital resource and technology levels, and unmet student needs, both academic and personal. Nothing is said in the response about the existence of a current analysis of the status in implementing personalized learning environments. A brief statement is included about a plan to have each participating LEA conduct a

baseline analysis of their status within the first 6 months of the project. The PLE Facilitators are identified as the individuals who will direct and support this effort. No information about the key goals, a timeline following the analysis, or the deliverables to result from the analysis which are key indicators of high quality are included.

C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	15

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Having students engage in personal goal setting is identified as a key component and a foundational activity of the applicant's plan for personalizing student learning. This plan expresses an intent to provide professional development to teachers, by subject area, to help them lead students in this effort and to ensure that this effort involves parents. Subcategories a-e are linked parts of these efforts.

The applicant discusses how the project will support environments to identify and pursue college and career related goals. The infusion of technology in the learning phase is reflected in the plan ensure access to digital resources, videos, etc. The applicant specifies that the concept of the flipped classroom (the 2011 research by Clive) is at the core of the project strategy. Teachers will be expected to use downloaded or device-dedicated lessons to enable students to pause and review the content until ready and comfortable to move further. Teachers are also expected to create personalized learning pathways with not all exposure to content occurring inside a classroom. Because the Long Island region is reported as a diverse community with many resources, opportunities, and ethnicities, the applicant expects this area of the project to be easier to accomplish. The flipped classroom is specified as being easier for teachers to make space for extended learning. Classrooms, the applicant reports, can look different and still expose students to the same required content.

Student and parent engagement is intended to take multiple forms and may include discussions, discussion guides, online modules and the like. Thus, one can locate who is to carry out the plan though a timeline line for this part of the the response is not found. Deepened learning experiences will result from reviews and analysis of curriculum, strategies, resources, and student performance data according to the applicant. These plans for improving and personalizing learning are stems requiring the insertion of parties who will carry out the associated activities, timelines that identify when particular aspects of the plan are to be put into effect and reviewed, the identification of processes for generating feedback and revision of areas of the plan requiring changes, and actual deliverables specifying to anyone who assesses the project and its progress what the end result of a particular activity is expected to be.

The applicant reports that the project identified a need to provide technology that enables students to access digital learning content without traveling from their home after school hours. They further address the provision of language support for non-English speaking families, the provision of child care or transportation for individuals to attend meetings or training. These accommodations do not specifically say they are to help ensure that the students are on track for meeting college and career ready standard but the inclusion of the statements in this section are taken to mean that is the intent. **When and by whom these accommodations and strategies enabling training and support to students are to take place is not specifically addressed (i.e., no timetable or parties responsible).**

	Available	Score
(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	16

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

In this section it is necessary to see **all** components of a high quality plan. Therefore a search of the response for the goals, processes, parties responsible, timelines, etc. was made. In the response to the section the applicant provides the following information:

Engage in training - The respondent describes a plan to have all participating teachers attend a **3 day summer institute** that will offer high quality professional development in creating Personalized Learning Environments, creating a flipped classroom, collecting and analyzing data to inform instruction continuously, and using and managing mobile devices. **During the school year**, job-embedded support emphasizing coordination of activities from professional development coaches is intended to be offered. Administrators will be encouraged to participate in the teacher training and will have their own professional development in project related areas. **The above is for Year 1. In Years 2-4 PD supports** will continue similarly with emphasis placed on various assessment measures taken previously. Personalized learning environments training will equip teachers to use the flipped classroom approach and emphasize how to use technology effectively. After hours training and area specific training will be afforded teachers and leaders.

Measuring Student Progress toward meeting college- and career ready standards - **Teachers will have access** to a Data Learning Portal, a one stop shop, for all project activities. **Teachers will be training on** and have the capability to create formative assessment. The applicant expects the student data easily interface with the new New York State Educational Data Portal (EDP).

Improve teacher and leader practice and effectiveness - The applicant points to the fact that the state's being a recipient of one of the first phases of RTTT was a result of the entire state having adopted the four core assurances of this grant opportunity. Identifying and retaining teachers and leaders who are high quality, the applicant states, involves monitoring student growth using a variety of measures over time and the use of both formal and informal observations. The Personalized Learning Education facilitator will be both collegial and will provide constructive feedback and suggestions to teachers and leaders. No mention is made about how effective teacher sill be rewarded or hoe recruitment efforts will be adapted to secure the best.

High quality learning resources aligned to college and career ready standards - The Full STEAM Ahead! project informs that it will concentrate on providing content-rich resources and assessments. **Resources selected for use will aligned to Common Core Standards** (selections made by professional development coaches and Model Schools professional developers in conjunction with recommendations from participating teachers and leaders. Community partners will be used to assist in providing access to diverse, real world experts successful in their field. A focus will also go to identifying student success stories, homegrown individuals whose stories will serve as a video resource or as an individual virtual dialogue to give student mental models of college and career success.

Processes and tools to match student needs - Teacher training as outlined above is intended to occur first according to the response. As the new EDP becomes available additional technology training will occur. Next they report a plan to offer job-embedded support. Next teachers be will encouraged to develop their knowledge and expertise in using student data to inform personalized learning experiences. The evaluation system will be a process factor as it will yield data on what and who is effective and what needs to be changed or improved upon to meet students' needs. Data analysis to focus on the diagnostic aspect of goals to effort to results are part of what this applicant reports is a focus. Throughout this process, individuals who are designated by their positions to carry out roles and responsibilities are expected to do so.

These plans are ambitious and seem logical in the larger perspective yet needed to be more clear and specific with regard to timelines, time interval beyond the yearly and ordinal ones noted, needed to be addressed. Also though there is a report of what positions carry out the training responsibilities, **there is no addressing of what parties do what activities beyond that. Among the activities, there is no information on how changes that are determined to be warranted will be reported and effected and who has the ultimate authority to do such adjustments. Likewise the emphasis here is on personalized learning so more attention to that topic and more specificity about how personalized learning would result from the efforts needed to be included.**

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	10

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

In looking for evidence of a high quality plan to support the implementation of Full STEAM Ahead!, reviewers are looking for evidence of practices, policies, and rules that will facilitate personalized learning. This applicant reports that this project has four tiers of governance. One tier is LEA Personalized Learning Facilitators, the second is quarterly regionally hosted USER Group meeting, the third is Full STEAM Ahead A annual Advisory Board Meetings which include the Lead LEA, PLE Facilitators, representatives from district PLE teams, and representatives from each community partner. The final tier consists of the Lead LEA and the Managing Partners' appointed Regional Directors. Besides quarterly meetings, meetings at the 4th tier will occur monthly. The goal of the slates of meetings is to ensure that the history of successful partnerships continues into this grant. Member partners will be encouraged to customize the Full STEAM Ahead project to their district.Therefore, here, the respondent points out that flexibility and autonomy are given to each respective level. PLE facilitators will provide in-district support to weave together individualized needs of schools and classrooms. Professional development to positively impact this occurring will be offered by the Lead LEA, the Managing partners, and the Community Expert.

At the student level the response indicates that eighth grade student have the ability to take Regent (higher level) I math and science courses in many districts. Some 8th graders who show promise may take Integrated Algebra, Earth Science, or Living Environment. Two schools in the partnership are reported to have a working relationship with Cradle of Aviation to provide the

Physics First curriculum. Over the course of the project the opportunities for lower grade level students to take Regent level courses is anticipated.

Common Core Standards are already adopted raising performance expectations for students.The Full STEAM Ahead initiative, the applicant reports, will allow students to learn and experience content and skills in a number of ways some of which relate directly to preferred learning styles. The technology upgrades will allow access and frequency of content availability to be enhanced. Finally the applicant reports that IEPs will be followed for students with disabilities. They report schools level support for English learners. However no mention of assistive technology and other individual approaches were mentioned.

The response addresses activities to be involved and identifies parties responsible.Tthere is a timeline --though not identified by specific date. There is no mention of how mastery of content, not seat time will be factored into the project. The plan does not speak definitively regarding how decision-making authority works among the various groups or what happens to recommendations and suggestions that require higher authority to effect.

Having students engage in personal goal setting is identified as a key component and a foundational activity of the applicant's plan. The plan further expresses the intent to provide professional development to teachers, by subject area, to help them lead students in this effort and to ensure that this effort involves parents. This student and parent engagement is intended to take more than form and may include discussions, discussion guides, online modules and the like.

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	9

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant reports the design of this project is to ensure that tools and content are available both during school and after hours to all stakeholders. The "Flipped Classroom" model is to be the driving initiative behind implementing personalized learning environments. This methodology will ensure that content is accessible through conventional methods and through more 21st Century modes including the Internet, videos, sound clips, interactive simulations, or hyperlinks. Teacher will receive encouragement to take advantage of the many free, open source resources available on the Internet such as Khan Academy, Class-Connect.com and iTunes U.The Data Learning Portal in use in the district will have additions as the project develops . Mobile carts equipped with wireless iPads and other devices are planned for use in the furtherance of the project. Teachers will receive an allotment to purchase additional applications to assist them with teaching their content. The technical support needs to ensure success of the project will be afforded. Peer-to-peer and teacher-to-teacher learning environments will be encouraged. Many existing data systems currently in use are already interoperable. An improved interoperable instructional data system will be addressed through the grant. Included in this section are additional pages showing the activities, date (timeline), and key personnel to be involved. This response meets the expectations for a high quality plan. **There is no mention of the training for parents to ensure they will have the appropriate levels of technical support.**

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	15

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Full STEAM Ahead's strategy for continuous improvement is described as one that will provide timely and regular feedback on progress toward goals, opportunities for ongoing corrections, and improvements in areas that include policy, management, professional development, resource allocation, professional development, evaluation and issues of overall effectiveness. Project personnel will collect data on the appropriateness, relevance and timeliness of initiatives. A feedback loop tied to all stakeholders and groups/boards will ensure that necessary modifications can occur. A Likert Scale will be used to assess attitudes, expectations, training, plaudits, and recommendations.

The Project Director and PLE Facilitator will ensure that data from surveys and other forms of evaluation are reported within two days to the administrative team for review. Ongoing status evaluations will be conducted and information shared with all stakeholders. The respondents state that they recognize organizational change is a continual process and organization success is contingent upon the ability and willingness to change when necessary. This applicant identifies 3 domains that will be involved in evaluation. Weekly logs and progress reports fit into Domain One. Domain Two will involve documenting the quality of program personnel, components and activities for appropriateness, relevance, timeliness, and whether the results were the desired results according to established goals. Domain 3 is level of documenting the impact of activities where all efforts will focus on analysis of the indicators correlated with program objectives. They have identified the Program Evaluation Review Technique (PERT) as the mechanism for project management. This tool will track, report and evaluate project activities. An example of the PERT tool is provided following this section in the grant application. This plan appears feasible,

comprehensive and likely to result in continuous improvement of the effort. It is rated high quality.

(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	5

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Strategies this applicant intends to use as part of its plan to ensure ongoing communication include regular contact with three groups listed below:

Internal stakeholders - those paid by the grant or whose pay or job will be impacted by the program

External Stakeholders - groups of people or individuals who have an interest in the including , parents, business community, local media, community agencies, service organizations

- MOUs, dialogue in face-to-face and written approaches, surveys, the dedicated website, etc. will be used to share timely, project specific information and impact information regarding how the project can or will impact the parties and the project participants now, during the project, and in the future

Students - The applicant is careful to address the issue of students in pointing out that they are often overlooked in communication efforts but will not be in this project. PLEs will facilitate making sure that teachers communicate with students how their involvement in this change process will improve both education and opportunity. The applicant states that they intend to put these processes in motion from Day 1 and continue this communication in an ongoing manner. A table is added to this section identifying the goal(s), evaluation objective and form of assessment. This supports the existence of a clear approach and high quality plan.

(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	3

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

In this section reviewers are trying whether the applicant has selected between 12 and 14 performance measures that result in showing how continuous improvement is to be achieved. The table inserted between sections (e) 2 and (E) (3) are indicated to be what the applicant presents to show that their evaluation measures are perfectly aligned to project needs, goals, and activities. and after (E) (4) labeled as (E)(3) include this data. For each of the 49 schools the performance measures are provided . Included as measures are the New York State Assessment in ELA for the appropriate grade level, the subgroups , baseline and target data. **Not all of required 12-14 required performance measures appear in this presented data. Nothing specific is written for the rationale for selecting the measures, for how the measure will be improved over time if it is not sufficient to gauge implementation progress, or for how the measure will provide rigorous, timely, formative information tailored to plan and theory. How the measure(s) will be reviewed is addressed in the narrative. This section contains parts of a high quality plan but not all parts and not in the degree needed to attain a high quality rating.**

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	4

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant reports a plan to evaluate all components of the proposed project at several points in each project year. As an example they report how teacher professional development will be evaluated using surveys after each PD session as well as after an unspecified period of project implementation. This will be done to determine the extent to which teachers report that the training impacted the way they teach.

The technology evaluation is planned for twice annually wherein the effectiveness from the perspectives of teachers and students will be collected. Listed as the bottom line in evaluating the effects of the proposed investment will be improvements in student knowledge, skills, and attitudes that propel them to excel. The applicant quotes the research of Cohen (1998) in saying that providing effective programs and services for high risk youth saves between $1.7 million and $2.3 million per youth over the course of their lives. They refer to www.ihep.org for some additional information on the benefits of a college degree on health and quality of life issue. The applicant expects this project to increase the likelihood of graduation from high school and enrolling in and graduating from college and entering the work force. The applicant succinctly provides meaningful information for evaluating effectiveness of investments. **No examples of the intended evaluations are provided therefore it cannot be determined whether the evaluations that are planned are of appropriate quality. There is also no mention of how the effective use of time will be evaluated.**

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	**10**	**9**

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

This section summarizes the applicant's plan for the budget:

1. The applicant says that Full STEAM Ahead! will provide all funds for technology, professional development, governance, and the STEM video project.
2. Each LEA will continue to cover the cost of salaries, benefits, and overhead for participating teachers and leaders outside of the scope of project costs.
3. Acquired technology and professional development are intended to supplement not supplant those things and dollars already in each district.

Costs and pricing provided in the budget are based on available educational pricing. Professional development costs are similar to those used in other grant submissions and are based on an average daily amount expected on Long Island.

Appropriate justifications are included for the requested total funding requested of $22,438,252. One time expenditures are listed as to be primarily intended for technology acquisition and one additional one time investment will be for the server for the Data Learning Portal. All other associated costs are recurring costs expected over the life of the grant.

The applicant states that sustainability will result from the personnel and partners being trained so that gains made can continue after the grant cycle. This section makes no mention of how the financial aspects of the project will be sustained.The budget seems reasonable and likely to develop and support project goals.

	Available	Score
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	**10**	**4**

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant definitively states that its 5 step plan is high quality. They back this statement by saying the following:(1) project goals are aligned with RTTTD goals, participants are well positioned to apply for local, state or federal funds (2) It is anticipated that all individual LEAs will benefit from personalized learning environments and will allocate budget funds to personnel, professional development, learning resources, and technology. (3) The four year term of the grant allows for extensive regional development of BOCES expertise in supporting personalized environments a sustained effect that will not be lost after the life of the grant. (4) A robust network of schools will be developed over the term of the grant that is expected to continue even after the grant ends. (5) Participating teachers and schools will become familiar and utilize the services of Integrated School Support Partners (ISSP) and will continue to do so after the grant. ISSPs will develop and sustain long term partnerships positively impacting the learning community.**This section does not include the indicators of a high quality plan (i.e., goals, activities, parties responsible, timelines, etc.) The option to include a budget for the 3 years after the grants was not elected. The applicant did not provide a specific, definitive plan to continue the improvements after the grant ends.** The information that is included appears is well thought out.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	**10**	**7**

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

This applicant describes a broad partnership that has formed to carry out this grant. A table to reflect the extent of the partnerships is provided. The fact that the LEAS in this project educate large numbers of minority students who often times do not reach their full potential in graduating from high school college and career ready is evidence of a need they are attempting to address. The linkages and affiliations that grow out of this grant are purposed to make a positive impact on this need.

Governance begins with the lead LEA and extends throughout the combination of groups formed and stakeholders, especially with parents and families. This partnership, it is reported, will afford shared expertise, close existing loopholes in services, and focus on an improved future for students by improving the professionals who serve them and the resources they use to serve .

Regional Information Centers support the information and technology needs of school districts on Long Island per the applicant. Survey results will further inform about needs and gaps in addition to information gleaned from meetings of partnership members.Throughout every phase of this proposal is evaluation of processes, effects, and efforts.

The goals of this project are definitely ambitious. The size of this new consortium appears challenging but the state has a history with RTTT (earlier phases) so it appears that expertise and infrastructure needed to aid in success are in place. Even so, the goals for improvement seem worthy and possible. Additionally the levels of support and buy-in for the project is supported by the volume of letters of support provided with the application.

Ten population desired results are not included in this section. Little is said about the population desred outcomes. Improvings results over time was not addressed in the response. Measures indicated do not all have measurable goals.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

Participating schools all meet the minimum 40% low income priority as evidenced by free/reduced lunch thresholds.

To meet the additional requirements of this section, applicants must provide evidence of building on the four Core Educational Assurance Areas : The applicant does by addressing the subsections below and by the many partnerships it has and will continue to form.

Improving Teaching and Learning - throughout the application they place an emphasis on improved teaching, learning and leading; through the use of rigorous evaluation systems for teachers and leaders; through the adoption of Common Core Standards and the focus on training and changes in instructional practices

Providing Personalized Learning Environments - there is a plan and structure for improving personalized learning environments particularly through grant funds; this will emphasize professional development, equipment acquisition and interfacing of components

Accelerating Achievement - the applicant sets goals for increasing achievement within all required subgroups through the use of data systems that will track, assess, and yield data on which to base educational and instructional decisions for moving forward

Expanding access to the most effective educators - the applicant seeks to make all teachers effective, they spend no time talking about what will happen with any ineffective one

Decreasing achievement gaps - the applicant has pre-set goals for the subgroups showing the widest disparities in performance though not all details of approaches to be taken with these groups is identified; the focus on these subgroups will impact impact the lowest achieving schools if they are successful in their efforts

Increase rates at which students graduate college and career ready - the emphasis on placing examples of success before the students is an example of how they intend to develop student interest and encourage student to do goal setting in this area

Support Students and Educators - professional development is embedded throughout the application

The plan presented is in a coherent way. Omitted required sections include addressing rewarding and retaining effective teachers and leaders.

Total	210	155